

2157. By Mr. SHANLEY: Petition of the State Court of Connecticut, Catholic Daughters of America, regarding the Mexican situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2158. Also, petition of Hollis D. Immick, of Meriden, Conn., protesting against section 55 (b) of the Revenue Act of 1934; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2159. Also, petition of the Grand Executive Council of the Connecticut Grand Lodge of the Order of the Sons of Italy in America, regarding legislation pertaining to old-age pension; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2160. Also, petition of the Branford Branch 1538, Connecticut National Association of Letter Carriers, referring to the observance of Armistice Day as a postal holiday; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2161. Also, petition of Group No. 356 of the Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, referring to General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2162. By Mr. SPENCE: Resolution adopted by the Sixth District Conference of the American Legion of Kentucky; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2163. Also, petition of John Gilligan and others, urging Congress that a uniform Federal old-age-pension law be enacted; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2164. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition by Council of the Borough of Point Pleasant, N. J., favoring an old-age-pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2165. Also, petition of Point Pleasant Lodge of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, New Jersey, favoring old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2166. Also, petition of the city of Plainfield, N. J., praying that October 11 of each year be proclaimed as Pulaski Day and known as a "national holiday"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2167. Also, petition of the State of New Jersey, opposing mob violence and lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2168. Petition of the Board of Commissioners of New Brunswick, N. J., opposing any form of Federal taxation that may be interpreted to impose a burden or obligation upon States and their political subdivisions, districts, or agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2169. Also petition of the Point Pleasant Borough Civic Club, New Jersey, favoring an old-age-pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2170. Also, petition of the Board of Commissioners of Newark, N. J., urging that October 11 of each year be proclaimed a national holiday to be known as "Pulaski Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2171. By Mr. SWEENEY: Petition of the Baptist Ministers' Conference of Cleveland, Ohio, regarding antilynching legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2172. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of citizens of Boston, Mass., favoring legislation for the Townsend plan of old-age revolving pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2173. Also, petition of citizens of Boston, Mass., protesting against conditions in Mexico and requesting the recall of Ambassador Josephus Daniels; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2174. Also, resolution of Group No. 228, Boston, of the Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, memorializing Congress to enact House Joint Resolution 81 and Senate Joint Resolution 11, directing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2175. Also, resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States, relative to prevention and punishment of the crime of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2176. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of F. Hilbrant and other citizens of Norwalk, Ohio, urging support of the Townsend pension bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2177. Also, petition of Trumbull Lodge, No. 73, Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, Warren, Ohio, by their corresponding representative, Calvin Love,

urging support of the McCarran amendment on prevailing wages as they fear without the amendment the relief bill will destroy their wages and what standard of living they now have; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2178. Also, petition of the Polish American Citizens Club, of Cleveland, Ohio, by their secretary, Henry Skezeckoski, urging support of House bill 2827, knowing as they do the opposite measure which does not provide unemployment insurance for those who have jobs at the present time; to the Committee on Labor.

2179. Also, petition of John L. Swank and other citizens of Toledo, Ohio, urging the Congress of the United States to pass a bill obligating the Government of the United States to pay every citizen of said Government, whose record is free of habitual criminality and who has attained the age of 60 years, a monthly pension of \$200 until the end of his life upon the sole condition that he agree, under oath, to spend the entire amount of the pension within the confines of the United States during the current month in which it is received; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2180. Also, petition of the Moniuszko Singing Society of Polish National Alliance, of Cleveland, Ohio, by their secretary, Vincenty Cikacz, urging support of House bill 2827; to the Committee on Labor.

2181. By Mr. TURNER: Petition regarding an act for relief of retired warrant officers of the Army who served honorably as commissioned officers during the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2182. By Mr. WALLGREN: Petition of the House of Representatives, State of Washington; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2183. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of Clarence Kelch, of Silverwood, Mich., and 48 other members of Farmers Unions, in Lapeer and Tuscola Counties, Mich., urging the prompt enactment of the Frazier-Lemke refinancing bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2184. Also, petition of Fred Elftman, Jr., of Pigeon, Mich., and 49 other members of Pigeon Local, No. 124, of the Farmers Union, urging the prompt enactment of the Frazier-Lemke refinancing bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2185. Also, petition of Archie Waggoner, of Vassar, Mich., and 49 other members of the Farmers Union, urging the prompt enactment of the Frazier-Lemke refinancing bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2186. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Townsend Revolving Club, of Leroy, Ill.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1935

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of mercies, in whom are the springs of all parental grace; we thank Thee for the spirit that breathes upon this earth of ours with patience, kindly care, and gracious works, wherein Thou dost reveal Thy loving-kindness in the morning and Thy faithfulness every night. Above all, we bless Thee for the precious human things of life: for the hearts that love and trust us, for the teaching of sorrow, for the ministry and use of pain, and for the healing touch of time, bringing to us wider thoughts and an ever-growing sympathy for all who are oppressed with wrong. Do Thou guard and garrison the hearts of all Thy people with the inestimable gift of peace, and enable us to accept, without repining, the discipline of the present time as the means whereby we may press forward to the goal of a high and holy influence among the nations of the world. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord and Savior. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 26, 1935, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask for a roll call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Copeland	Keyes	Pope
Ashurst	Costigan	King	Radcliffe
Austin	Couzens	La Follette	Reynolds
Bailey	Cutting	Lewis	Robinson
Bankhead	Dickinson	Logan	Russell
Barbour	Dieterich	Loneragan	Schall
Barkley	Donahay	McAdoo	Schwellenbach
Bilbo	Duffy	McCarran	Sheppard
Black	Fletcher	McGill	Shipstead
Bone	Frazier	McKellar	Steiwer
Borah	George	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Gerry	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Bulley	Gibson	Metcalf	Townsend
Bulow	Glass	Minton	Trammell
Burke	Gore	Moore	Truman
Byrd	Guffey	Murray	Tydings
Byrnes	Hale	Neely	Vandenberg
Capper	Harrison	Norbeck	Van Nuys
Carey	Hastings	Norris	Wagner
Clark	Hatch	Nye	Walsh
Connally	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Coolidge	Johnson	Pittman	White

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BACHMAN], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MURPHY] are necessarily detained from the Senate; that the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] are absent because of illness; and that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is absent on account of official business.

Mr. AUSTIN. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is necessarily detained from the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 94) providing for the participation of the United States in the California-Pacific International Exposition to be held at San Diego, Calif., in 1935 and 1936, authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 140) to provide for the completion of the publication of the writings of George Washington.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5221) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act with respect to rice, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 31. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice the healing art in the District of Columbia to Dr. Chester C. Groff;

S. 402. An act to amend section 824 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 330. An act for the relief of Sophie de Sota;

H. R. 529. An act granting compensation to George S. Conway, Jr.;

H. R. 3373. An act for the relief of Anna S. Carrigan;

H. R. 3982. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between Rockport, Ind., and Owensboro, Ky.;

H. R. 5701. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Indiana to construct, maintain, and operate a

free highway bridge across the Wabash River at or near La Fayette, Ind.;

H. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the California-Pacific International Exposition to be held at San Diego, Calif., in 1935 and 1936, authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to provide for the completion of the publication of the writings of George Washington.

WILLIAM P. M'CRACKEN, JR.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the Sergeant at Arms has a report to submit to the Senate, which will now be received.

The Sergeant at Arms, Chesley W. Jurney, submitted the following report:

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1935.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE:

The case of *Chesley W. Jurney, petitioner, v. William P. MacCracken, Jr.*, having been decided in favor of the petitioner by the Supreme Court of the United States, the said William P. MacCracken, Jr., pursuant to a stipulation entered into on February 15, 1934, by and between the said William P. MacCracken, Jr., and myself, as Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, submitted himself to me on February 26, 1935, for commitment to the District of Columbia Jail for the period of 10 days prescribed in Senate Resolution 185, agreed to on February 14, 1934. I thereupon, at 4 p. m. on said day, committed him to the duly constituted authorities of said jail, and their receipt is hereto attached.

CHESLEY W. JURNEY,
Sergeant at Arms United States Senate.

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1935.

To the duly constituted authorities in charge of the District of Columbia Jail:

SIRS: In accordance with the order of the United States Senate adopted Wednesday, February 14, 1934 (legislative day of Tuesday, Feb. 6, 1934), a copy of which is hereto attached, I now deliver to your institution for confinement therein for the term set forth in the order of the Senate heretofore referred to, William P. MacCracken, Jr., and ask that a copy of this letter be signed by you as my receipt for the delivery and confinement of the said person in your institution.

Respectfully,

CHESLEY W. JURNEY,
Sergeant at Arms United States Senate.

Received the above person at 4 p. m., February 26, 1935.

THOMAS M. RIVES,
Superintendent District of Columbia Jail.
By E. G. TURNURE,
Receiving Officer.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD, succeeding the report by the Sergeant at Arms, a statement by William P. MacCracken, Jr., made February 26, 1935.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] whether he has seen the statement?

Mr. BLACK. I assume it is the same statement that was in the press. If it is, I have seen it.

Mr. NORRIS. I also saw that statement, and I doubt very much whether it recites the facts as they are. I do not believe that the Senate ought to permit to be printed in the RECORD a statement by the defendant in the case which is contrary to the facts as established in the Senate. I realize that the Senator from Alabama had charge of the matter, and I do not wish to interfere, if he has seen the statement, but if it is the same statement I saw, I do not think it states the truth.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the statement, but it has long been the practice, and a fair one, that when anyone has offered to make a statement to permit it to go into the RECORD for what it is worth. Inasmuch as the statement has been presented here today, I think it quite proper that it should go into the RECORD.

Mr. NORRIS. If the statement I saw in the newspapers is correct and is the same as that now being offered for the

RECORD, there ought to be some sort of an apology offered by the Supreme Court of the United States for sustaining the action of the Senate, for if that statement be true, then, we have put in jail an innocent man who has committed no crime or done anything wrong. The statement is at complete variance with what the Senate found to be the facts and that the Supreme Court supported.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I will state that, while I have offered no objection to the presentation of the statement for the RECORD, I desire to be distinctly understood that I do not agree that the statement is correct. I do not concede its correctness by not objecting to its being placed in the RECORD. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] that certain inferences from the statement in part, in my judgment, at least, are contrary to the facts submitted to the committee and upon which the Senate sentenced Mr. MacCracken.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, in view of statements which have been made about the matter I shall object, for the present at least, the inclusion of the statement in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. AUSTIN. I give notice that at an appropriate time I shall read the statement, and perhaps I shall have something to say about it.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the chief examiner of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of papers on the files of the Commission in Washington, and in certain field offices, that are not needed in the transaction of public business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and asking for action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BULOW and Mr. WHITE members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

SAN FRANCISCO PEAKS TOLL ROAD, ARIZONA (S. DOC. NO. 25)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 234 of the Seventy-third Congress submitted by Mr. ASHURST, information relative to the purchase of a toll road in the Coconino National Forest, Ariz., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, ordered to be printed as a Senate document, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, February 26, 1935.

The PRESIDENT UNITED STATES SENATE.

SIR: Reference is made to Senate Resolution 234 of the Seventy-third Congress requesting this Department to enter into negotiations with the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co. of Arizona for the purchase of the toll road to the summit of the San Francisco Peaks in the Coconino National Forest, State of Arizona.

During the past season the Department caused an examination to be made of the road in question by Mr. W. J. Ward, associate highway engineer of the Bureau of Public Roads of this Department, who, after making a detailed study of the road and other possible locations for a satisfactory highway to the summit of the San Francisco Peaks, reported, with respect to the existing road, as follows:

"The existing road to the top of the mountain is known as the San Francisco Mountain Boulevard or the Weatherford Road, after its promoter. This road was constructed with private funds under permits from the Secretary of Agriculture, the first of which was granted to J. W. Weatherford in 1916. A later permit granted to the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co. in 1920 stipulated that, on demand of the Secretary of Agriculture after 15 years from that date or at intervals of 5 years thereafter, the road should be surrendered to the Government upon payment of its reasonable physical value.

"Construction was begun about 1919 and completed in 1923. The company operated this road thereafter as a toll road until 1934, when they were unable to provide proper maintenance. It is the desire of the company that the Secretary of Agriculture exercise its right and take over the road, since it has not been a financial success. The company claims to have spent about \$150,000 on the road to date.

"This road begins at the toll house, 3.5 miles north of Flagstaff, on the Fort Valley Road, and extends to a point on top of the ridge between Agassiz and Humphrey Peaks, elevation about 12,000 feet, having a length of 15 miles. Standards of alignment

and grade are very low, there being 10 switch-backs of about 25-foot radius and many more of somewhat larger radius. Grades are not uniform and range up to 18 percent, with very little suitable for high gear. Construction was done to a width of 12 to 15 feet, but lack of maintenance has reduced the effective width several feet at this time. It is very rough and barely passable from toll house to mile 10 at Fremont Saddle and entirely impassable beyond this point.

"U. S. highways nos. 66 and 89 pass through Flagstaff, population 3,900, which will be the source of San Francisco Mountain traffic. The Fort Valley Road extends from Flagstaff to Fort Valley via toll house, and the Hart Prairie and other minor roads continue entirely around the west and north sides of the mountain and join U. S. no. 89 near Deadman's Wash, northeast of the mountain. The Schultz Pass Road extends from the Fort Valley Road to toll house to Schultz Pass, then descends again north of Mount Eldon to U. S. no. 89. Flagstaff has built a low-standard road along their water conduit from Schultz Pass to the intake near Jack Smith Spring, from which point the Forest Service has built a narrow development road 4 miles in length around to a spring on the north side of Humphrey Peak. Other minor roads are shown on the map.

"The San Francisco Mountain Boulevard has been open for travel in normal years only about 90 days per year. This was largely due to the great difficulties encountered on the north side of Fremont Peak between Fremont Saddle and Doyles Saddle, where snow and ice collect on the north slope and where slides frequently occur.

"Since none of the existing toll road will be utilized on the recommended route, its value to the Government is limited to its value as a fire-patrol and forest-administration road and to its value to engineers and contractors during location and construction. This road is of some value to the Forest Service from a point 1 mile north of the toll house to Doyles Saddle, a distance of about 10 miles, since it traverses an area not served by existing roads or by the recommended route. The Forest Service estimates a similar road suitable to their purpose and to serve this area would cost \$20,000 to \$30,000 to construct.

"For a location survey this road would eliminate the necessity for a pack train for a period of about 2 months as well as save some time. The estimated value of the road for this purpose is \$500.

"Its value to contractors is rather intangible. With some improvement it would serve to make the recommended route accessible for equipment at Fremont Saddle and various places beyond that point. The contractor's method of operation is also a factor in valuing the present road for this purpose. It is believed \$2,000 to \$3,000 would be a fair value to contractors of this road."

The Forest Service reports that the present road is paralleled by an existing development road constructed by the Forest Service, which serves in a large measure the administrative needs of that Service. Furthermore, there are other forest-protection roads reaching the region from the north side of the mountain. Consequently the Forest Service does not feel justified in placing any appraised value on the toll road for the protection requirements of that Service.

Notwithstanding substantial expenditures made by the present owners of the toll road, it is the judgment of this Department that the road is totally inadequate for safe public use. It is unsurfaced and in large part consists of merely a single-track road of dangerously narrow width. The hazards of numerous switch-backs of as little as 25 percent radius of curvature and the objectionable nature of gradients which are not uniform in character and which range up to 18 percent are, of course, obvious. Only a small proportion of the traveling public would be willing to use or could safely use a road of such character even though maintenance work was performed. It is stated that at no time since the completion of the road have the revenues been sufficient to cover the cost of maintenance.

In view of the facts found, the Department does not feel that it will be warranted in entering into negotiations for the purchase of this road at any price.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) R. G. TUGWELL,
Acting Secretary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

House Joint Memorial 5

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Thirty-eighth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, convened in regular session, respectfully represent that:

Whereas the early and complete development of Tongue Point as a secondary naval base in accordance with the original understanding between the citizens of Clatsop County and the United States should be undertaken immediately; and

Whereas the immediate establishment of one or more fully equipped flying fields in the State of Oregon to be maintained by adequate Army personnel should be undertaken by the Federal Government; and

Whereas the Federal Government has expended approximately \$470,000,000 on the Pacific coast for military posts and naval shore

establishments, and of that sum approximately \$330,000,000 has been expended in the State of California and \$136,000,000 in the State of Washington and only \$5,000,000 in the State of Oregon, or less than 1 percent of the full amount expended by the Federal Government on the Pacific coast for national defense has been allocated to the State of Oregon; and

Whereas there are at the present time some 80 active and inactive military and naval posts on the Pacific coast and Oregon's share only consists under the defense program of one military post at Fort Stevens, which is inactive, a radio station at Astoria, and the undeveloped secondary naval base at Tongue Point, Clatsop County; and

Whereas the entrance to the Columbia River should be adequately protected by the best modern defensive military equipment used by the air, Army, and naval forces as a hostile force landing on the Pacific coast would have one of two main objectives:

1. To seize, occupy, and destroy important territory and restrict vital commerce in order to force a settlement of the dispute on terms favorable to the invader;

2. To seize and occupy territory preliminary to annexation and colonization by the invading power; and

Whereas a survey of the Oregon coastline shows that in order to accomplish either of the above objectives the landing of hostile forces at any point other than the Columbia River would be ineffective unless the invaders were able to penetrate the coast range and occupy the valleys between the Cascade and coast ranges, and a hostile power able to occupy the territory adjacent to the Columbia River would restrict commerce at that point and enable them to send cruisers, destroyers, and troop transports up the Columbia and Willamette Rivers as far as Vancouver and Portland and enable them to establish a base for the conquest of the great wheat belt of eastern Oregon and Washington as well as the Willamette Valley; and

Whereas military authorities have reached the conclusion that in order to safely defend this area there should be established:

1. Fort Stevens:

(a) Three batteries railroad artillery. This has already been recommended to the War Department by the Coast Artillery, but no appropriation has been made for the transportation and installation of the same.

(b) One battalion Regular Army field artillery, 155-mm howitzer; detachment of antiaircraft artillery; at least 1 searchlight platoon; 1 gun battery and 1 machine-gun battery and a mine-laying detachment.

2. Flying fields:

Two first-class, fully equipped flying fields established by the Army Air Corps and maintained by Regular Army equipped personnel. One of the fields to be located in the vicinity of Portland and the other in central or southwestern Oregon, and each field should have the following permanent garrison detachment Air Corps: Detachment antiaircraft artillery, at least 1 searchlight platoon, 1 gun battery, and one machine-gun battery, and the fields to be maintained so that a large fleet of all types of airplanes could arrive at the field immediately prepared for action and utilize the field as a base of operations.

3. The Oregon National Guard Field Artillery 166-mm Howitzer Regiment should be completed by adding the headquarters and service units and two firing batteries.

The Oregon National Guard partial regiment of coast artillery harbor defense, consisting of five batteries, should be converted to antiaircraft artillery and additional units added to complete the regiment; and

Whereas a grave emergency exists from the fact that we, the greatest creditor nation of the world, are envied by all nations, and that the only unprotected spot on our Pacific coastline is the State of Oregon, and in case of war with any foreign nation we would be the vulnerable point of attack: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring therein), That we, your memorialists, the Thirty-eighth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, convened in regular session, respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to pass appropriate legislation to carry out the provisions embodied in this memorial; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the Oregon delegation in Congress, and that the secretary of state is hereby instructed to transmit the same.

Adopted by the house February 7, 1935.

JOHN E. COOTER,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the senate February 18, 1935.

HENRY L. CORBETT,
President of the Senate.

(Endorsed: House Joint Memorial No. 5. Introduced by Representative Carter. W. F. Drager, chief clerk. Filed Feb. 22, 1935, Earl Snell, secretary of state.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Senate Concurrent Resolution Q

Whereas there is no bridge across the Little Missouri River within the limits of the Fort Berthold Reservation so that the

Indians living north and west of this river find it difficult at times to cross the Little Missouri to get to the Elbowoods Bridge; and

Whereas there is a need that such bridge be constructed for the convenience and welfare of those Indians living north and west of the Little Missouri: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring), That we respectfully request the construction of this bridge, and that it be considered a Federal project, and the same be constructed from Federal relief funds recently granted by Congress, and that the work of the construction of said bridge, as far as possible, be contributed by the Indians on relief; this bridge to be built on the trail now passing south of Independence and crossing section 27, township 148, range 91, Dunn County, approximately 4 miles northwest of the Fort Berthold Bridge, also known as the "Four Bears Bridge", across the Missouri River, or at the most feasible location in that vicinity.

A. S. MARSHALL,
President of the Senate.
F. E. TUNELL,
Secretary of the Senate.
WILLIAM M. CROCKETT,
Speaker of the House.
WALTER S. MARTIN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Senate Concurrent Resolution T

Be it enacted by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring):

Whereas a large percentage of the farmers of the State of North Dakota are experiencing a shortage of feed for their livestock because of crop failure in the year 1934 by reason of the drought and have not the means with which to purchase sufficient grains for feeding purposes at their present high prices; and

Whereas farmers are receiving Federal aid for the purchasing of feed to sustain their livestock, but that the aid or relief provided is inadequate with which to purchase sufficient feed at present high prices, even though the Federal allowance has been increased about 50 percent, since feed has also appreciated in price in about the same proportion; and

Whereas a large number of livestock have perished and many more will perish unless relief can be had; and

Whereas large quantities of feed, consisting of oats, barley, and low grades of wheat fit for feeding purposes, are available in the Dominion of Canada at considerably lower prices than prevail here, and that the importation of feed grains would not in any way prove detrimental to the agriculture industry of this State or of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Twenty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, That we respectfully petition the President of the United States, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the Congress of the United States to permit limited quantities of feed grains to be shipped into the United States, duty free, and in sufficient amount to relieve the acute feed situation that now prevails, and thereby prevent large losses by starvation of livestock in this and adjoining States; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, Congressmen WILLIAM LEMKE and USHER L. BURDICK, and United States Senators LYNN J. FRAZIER and GERALD P. NYE.

A. S. MARSHALL,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
F. E. TUNELL,
Secretary of the Senate.
WILLIAM M. CROCKETT,
Speaker of the House.
WALTER S. MARTIN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY.

Joint Resolution 1, Laws of 1935

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt measures directed against mob violence and lynching

Whereas in many sections of the United States crimes of violence are rapidly increasing both in numbers and in seriousness; and

Whereas one of the most deplorable types of crime is the wanton destruction of human life, public and private property by mobs under so-called "lynch law" and

Whereas such crimes strike at the very fundamentals of our constitutional rights and our system of democratic government, tending, if unchecked, to result in an absolute disregard for and defiance of duly constituted agencies charged with the protection of life and property, and with the proper enforcement of our criminal laws; and

Whereas a continual disregard of the taking of human life and the destruction of property by irresponsible individuals banded

together under the influence of excitement to usurp the prerogatives of legal agencies devoted to the apprehension, prosecution, and punishment of criminals, can but encourage the rising tide of violence; and

Whereas a stable government can only be maintained where the courts, operating under due process of law, shall be the only agency or power permitted to deprive any citizen of his constitutional rights to life and liberty; and

Whereas we firmly believe that this unfortunate situation can be best curtailed and eradicated through the power of our Federal Government: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, 1. That the Congress of the United States now in session be memorialized and requested to as speedily as possible adopt and pass some remedial measure, and to take such other action as may be necessary, fit, and proper to curtail as far as possible under Federal laws this growing national evil of mob violence and lynching, to the end that everyone in the United States of America may be accorded and guaranteed full protection of life, liberty, and property under our Constitution; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this joint resolution be transmitted to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the State of New Jersey.

2. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately.

Approved February 21, 1935.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, which was ordered to lie on the table:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 7

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October, 1779, is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, and other States of the Union through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as "General Pulaski's Memorial Day"; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observance and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated October 11, 1921, October 11, 1931, October 11, 1932, and October 11, 1934, as "General Pulaski's Memorial Day" in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas assembled:

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to Hon. Ignatius E. Werwinski, United States Commissioner of Deeds of Indiana, South Bend, Ind., by the secretary of the senate.

Approved, February 15, 1935.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted at a meeting of the Property Owners Association of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the enactment of legislation establishing an equity capital tax to apply to all equity in capital, and also legislation to abolish the "British land and property tax system" in the United States, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of Mrs. Waverly Lee, of Dillwyn, Va., praying for the enactment of a Federal old-age pension law, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by Junker-Ball Post, No. 1865, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, favoring the enactment of the so-called "Patman bill", being the bill (H. R. 1) to provide for the immediate payment to veterans of the face value of their adjusted-

service certificates and for controlled expansion of the currency, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate several memorials of citizens of New York City, N. Y., and New Haven, Conn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation inimical to the interests of investors in securities of public-utility companies, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also laid before the Senate petitions, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Flint and vicinity, in the State of Michigan, praying for the prompt enactment of legislation to eradicate all subversive movements aimed at the destruction of the Government, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate several petitions and letters and telegrams in the nature of petitions from sundry citizens of California, Kentucky, New Jersey, New York, and Texas, praying for the adoption of the work-relief program recommended by the President of the United States, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate a telegram from Ignatius K. Werwinski, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of pending legislation proclaiming October 11 in each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the District of Columbia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, favoring the enactment of House bill 2897, making it a crime to advocate or promote the overthrow of the Government by force or violence, etc., which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the District of Columbia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, favoring the enactment of legislation establishing in the national capital a museum of American history, where historical documents may be collected, preserved, and made accessible, etc., which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of Local Union No. 1856, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the retention of the so-called "McCarran amendment", relative to prevailing wage scales, in the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) making appropriations for relief purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by Walter J. Hatzfeld Post, No. 356, the American Legion, Department of Missouri, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of the so-called "Patman bill", being the bill (H. R. 1) to provide for the immediate payment to veterans of the face value of their adjusted-service certificates and for controlled expansion of the currency, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Common Councils of the cities of Helena, Ark.; New Britain, Conn.; Calumet City, Ill.; Frankfort, East Chicago, and South Bend, Ind.; Detroit, Mich.; Portsmouth, N. H.; Toledo and Youngstown, Ohio; New Kensington, Pa.; Klamath Falls, Oreg.; Bristol, R. I.; the board of directors of Fairmont, W. Va.; the board of commissioners of the city of Newark, N. J.; and the mayor and aldermen of the city of Savannah, Ga., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 in each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. ASHURST presented a concurrent memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, praying that part of the proposed appropriation of about \$4,800,000,000 requested by the President for public-works improvement be set aside exclusively for highway purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See concurrent memorial printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on the 26th instant, p. 2605, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. NORRIS presented a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska, memorializing

Congress to enact legislation establishing a national park to be known as the "Lewis and Clark National Park" in Burt, Thurston, and Dakota Counties, Nebr., which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

(See resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on the 26th instant, p. 2607, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. BAILEY presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to use granite and natural stone in the construction of public buildings

Whereas the Federal Government is contemplating an extensive Public Works program, under which many public buildings will be erected throughout the United States; and

Whereas the present status of unemployment in the granite and stone industries in the State of North Carolina and other granite- and stone-producing States is deplorable, it being estimated that from 80 to 85 percent of granite and stone employees are on Federal relief; and

Whereas the greater portion of the cost of finished granite and stone is incurred by labor; and

Whereas the quality and durability of granite and stone buildings unquestionably excels that of buildings constructed of inferior materials; and

Whereas from the standpoint of economy and prudent policy it is advisable that lasting and durable materials be used in the construction of public buildings: Now be it therefore

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Carolina (the house of representatives concurring), That Congress be respectfully urged and petitioned to enact legislation, or to otherwise take appropriate action to require that granite and natural stone be used in the construction of public buildings to be erected under the Public Works program; and that the secretary of state be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President, Vice President, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and to the Members of Congress from the State of North Carolina.

In the general assembly, read three times and ratified this the 19th day of February 1935.

A. H. GRAHAM,
President of the Senate.

R. G. JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Examined and found correct.

R. G. CARSON,
For Committee.

Mr. PITTMAN presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Assembly joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact suitable legislation to impose a tariff on copper

Whereas the present tariff on copper will expire by limitation on June 30 of the present year, unless congressional legislation extending the same shall be enacted prior thereto; and

Whereas a discontinuance of said tariff would be destructive of the copper industry in the State of Nevada and adjoining States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada, That Congress be memorialized to enact such legislation as will continue a tariff on copper not less than 9 cents; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Nevada to each of our Senators at Washington, D. C., and to our Representatives in Congress.

FRED S. ALWARD,
President of the Senate.

EDWARD A. DUCKER, Jr.,
Secretary of the Senate.

WILLIAM KENNETT,
Speaker of the Assembly.

LEONARD A. WILSON,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

State of Nevada, Executive Department. Approved February 16, 1935.

RICHARD KIRMAN, Governor.

Mr. PITTMAN also presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada, That Congress be memorialized to provide for the State of Nevada, under the provisions of Executive Order No. 6251, dated August 19, 1933, Senate Resolution No. 80, dated May 29, 1933, and under Senate Joint Resolution No. 74, dated April 14, 1934, a survey of the present and future market for electricity, the methods for balancing supply and demand; cost for electricity, cost for transmission and distribution to consumers; survey of electric rates, and formulation of a program of public works, which will present a complete statement of all charges for electricity for every community in Nevada; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit a duly certified copy of this resolution, under the seal of the State of Nevada, to the Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, to each of our Senators in the United States Senate, to our Representative in Congress, and to the Hon. Frank R. McNinch, Chairman Federal Water Power Act Commission.

FRED S. ALWARD,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD A. DUCKER, Jr.,
Secretary of the Senate.
WILLIAM KENNETT,
Speaker of the Assembly.
LEONARD A. WILSON,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

State of Nevada, Executive Department. Approved February 16, 1935.

RICHARD KIRMAN, Governor.

Mr. KING presented a resolution adopted by the board of commissioners of the city of Salt Lake City, Utah, favoring the enactment of pending legislation proclaiming October 11 in each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. VAN NUYS presented resolutions of the Common Councils of the cities of East Chicago, Frankfort, and South Bend, Ind., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 in each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MALONEY presented resolutions adopted by the Common Councils of the cities of New Britain and Stamford, Conn., favoring the enactment of pending legislation proclaiming October 11 in each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of members of the Holy Name Society of St. Thomas' Church, of Waterbury, and State Court of Connecticut, Catholic Daughters of America, assembled at Fairfield, in the State of Connecticut, protesting against alleged antireligious conditions and religious persecutions in the Republic of Mexico, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by Boston Grange, No. 1838, Patrons of Husbandry, of Emporia, Kans., favoring the repeal of the Federal tax on gasoline, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of the president and directors of the Norton (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing a 30-hour-work week in industry, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BARBOUR presented resolutions adopted at a meeting of Salem Grange, No. 172, Patrons of Husbandry, of Salem, N. J., favoring the repeal of the Federal tax on gasoline, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Council of the borough of Point Pleasant, N. J., favoring the passage of the so-called "Townsend old-age pension plan", which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Common Council of the city of Plainfield and the Board of Commissioners of the city of Newark, in the State of New Jersey, favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 in each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. COPELAND presented a resolution adopted by the Webster Chamber of Commerce, of Webster, N. Y., favoring the "commodity-dollar" plan of regulating the gold value of United States currency as advocated by Dr. George F. Warren of Cornell University; which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Railroad Brotherhoods' Savings & Building Association, of New York City, favoring the repeal of the exemption granted to dividends derived from shares of Federal savings and loan associations from certain taxation, or the granting of a similar exemption to dividends derived from shares of such associations operating under State charters, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Carl Follen Unit No. 103, Steuben Society of America, of Richmond Hill,

N. Y., favoring an amendment to the Constitution whereby the final declaration as to whether the Nation shall engage in war shall be left to the decision of the people by referendum, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Common Council of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., and Groups 1754 and 1459, Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, of Jamaica and Schenectady, respectively, in the State of New York, favoring the enactment of legislation providing that October 11 in each year be proclaimed General Pulaski's Memorial Day, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WALSH presented a petition of members of the Neighborhood Club, of Arlington, Mass., praying for the enactment of certain banking legislation (suggested by Rev. Charles E. Coughlin, of Michigan), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a petition of Fitchburg Local, No. 12, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Fitchburg, Mass., praying for the adoption of the so-called "McCarran amendment" for providing for the payment of the prevailing wage in the expenditure of appropriations for public works relief purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation making appropriations for relief purposes without specifying how the money is to be spent, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented petitions of William J. Cooney Post, No. 121, the American Legion, of Leicester; Amesbury Auxiliary to Post No. 2016, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of Amesbury; Daniel J. Purcell Post, No. 241, American Legion, of Monson; American Legion Auxiliary, Post No. 5, of Worcester; and sundry citizens of Ipswich, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the immediate cash payment of adjusted-service certificates of World War veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of the Fall River branch of the American League Against War and Fascism, of Fall River, and members of the Fairlawn Community Methodist Episcopal Church, of Shrewsbury, in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of old-age-pension legislation, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorials of W. Dudley Cotton and sundry other citizens of Boston and vicinity, in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against publication of individual income-tax returns, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Municipal Council of the city of Gloucester, Mass., protesting against any reduction in tariffs affecting the fishing industry, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a communication from the chairman Special St. Lawrence Committee, Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association, of Boston, Mass., listing organizations and associations which have recorded their opposition to the ratification of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Deep Waterway Treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the memorial of Russell B. Stearns, of Dedham, and sundry other citizens, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation inimical to the interest of investors in public-utility companies, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented the memorial of employees of the White & Bagley Co., of Worcester, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation establishing a 30-hour-work week in industry, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of Dr. J. F. D. Delia, Sr., of Alexandria, La., praying for the enactment of legislation providing a Chiropody Corps for the United States Army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

N. R. A. PRICE FIXING AND PRODUCTION CONTROL

Mr. VANDENBERG. I desire to present an important memorial with a brief word of explanation in connection with it.

There was organized yesterday in Washington a preliminary national committee for the elimination of price fixing and production control from N. R. A. codes in the future. It is a committee representing some of the finest industrial thought of the country. It reflects also the viewpoint of much consumer thinking, which believes that legalized monopoly is strangling the country. It is the committee which is undertaking to challenge the attitude of the National Manufacturers Association and the United States Chamber of Commerce insofar as these great organizations have advocated that the N. R. A. shall be continued practically in its existing form, when the existing law expires next June.

I ask that a very brief statement of the principles adopted by the committee and representative of the basic philosophy which always heretofore has saved America may be read by the clerk at the desk. It goes to the heart of the N. R. A. problem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

THE PLATFORM OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR THE ELIMINATION OF PRICE FIXING AND PRODUCTION CONTROL—ADOPTED FEBRUARY 27, 1935

We affirm that the monopolistic power of price fixing and production control proffered to industry under N. R. A. is traditionally and economically unsound and dangerous. This is not only doing an injustice to the consumer, but is actually retarding recovery.

High costs and prices produced by such means lead to decreased volume of business and employment. Lower costs and lower prices which come from free competition will increase both volume and employment.

Trade-practice provisions designed to accomplish price fixing or production control must inevitably lead to regimentation of business and to the sacrifice of efficiency at the cost of the consumer.

Price-control power in the hands of industry today is working a great hardship upon many small industries.

We, therefore, insist that it is in the interest of recovery that there be incorporated in whatsoever legislation there may be to modify or continue the present National Industrial Recovery Act an affirmative prohibition against direct or indirect price fixing or production control.

If in the interest of the public welfare there is needed any additional legislation governing trade practices, let it be general in character and applied alike to all types of industry.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I associate myself with this sound general philosophy. I wish to indicate further that it is the announced purpose of the committee, according to its own statement, to undertake the mobilization of proof that both big and little industry in the United States subscribes in an overwhelming degree to this declaration of principle and to this demand for the restoration of free competition in respect to prices and production.

I want the RECORD to show the preliminary membership of the committee which issues this statement and which now proposes to contact 100,000 American industrialists. It is headed by Mr. Robert W. Irwin, president of the Robert W. Irwin Co., of Grand Rapids, Mich., who is chairman of the code authority, furniture manufacturing industry, and also a member of the durable goods industries committee. I ask that the complete membership of the committee may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR THE ELIMINATION OF PRICE FIXING AND PRODUCTION CONTROL IN INDUSTRY

Robert W. Irwin, chairman, Robert W. Irwin Co., Grand Rapids, Mich.; E. R. Beetham, American Excelsior Corporation, Chicago; Excelsior Supply Co., Cleveland; Col. F. M. Curlee, Curlee Clothing Co., St. Louis, Mo.; Erwin Funk, Washington representative National Editorial Association, Burlington Hotel; F. E. Blake, Appleton Rubber Co., Franklin, Mass.; F. H. Mueller, Mueller Furniture Co., Grand Rapids, Mich.; John M. Brower, Brower Furniture Co., Grand Rapids, Mich.; Charles Kirchen, West Michigan Furniture Co., Holland, Mich.; G. A. Stockhus, West End Furniture Co., Rockford, Ill.; L. A. Cornelius, president Wolverine Brass Works, Grand Rapids, Mich.; James D. Andrew, American Boiler Manufacturers Association and affiliated industries; George L. Markland, presi-

dent Philadelphia Board of Trade, Philadelphia, Pa.; Herbert Guttersen, president Carpet Institute, Chrysler Building, New York City; John A. Sweetser, president Bigelow-Sanford Carpet Co., Inc., 140 Madison Avenue, New York City, F. H. Coffey, Kent-Coffey, Manufacturers, Lemon, N. C.; O. A. Moeller, Kentucky Flooring Co., Orange, Va.; S. H. Curlee, Jr., Curlee Clothing Co., 1001 Washington Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.; F. M. Brumby, president Brumby Chair Co., Marietta, Ga.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In conclusion, I ask that a statement by Mr. Irwin may also be printed in the RECORD. It is a statement dealing with the proposed substitution of a so-called "open-price plan" for the existing N. R. A. price-fixing scheme.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PURPOSE AND EFFECT OF THE "OPEN-PRICE PLAN" (OR PUBLICITY OF PRICES)

(By Robert W. Irwin, president Robert W. Irwin Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., chairman code authority furniture manufacturing industry)

Many lines of industry have, through the powers granted under N. R. A., adopted this very effective plan as a means of price fixing or price control.

Under this plan, if adopted by an industry and incorporated in its code, every unit in that industry is compelled to publicly file prices on all of its products. Prices are usually filed with the industry's code authority, and are available to all members of that industry.

The person or concern is at liberty to change prices at will, but the time in which new prices may be made effective varies from immediately to a period of several days. The object of the waiting period, before goods may be sold at changed prices, is that all members of that industry may be advised of the change and thereby have an opportunity to better meet the competition brought about as a result of these changes.

Under the plan no manufacturer may sell his product at prices or terms under other than those on file with whatever agency is designated for this purpose. To do so would be a violation of the law, and such an act would carry the penalties provided in the N. R. A. statute.

Its proponents claim that its purpose is not price fixing, but rather to stabilize competition and to raise the ethical standards of business. It is supposed to prevent so-called "cutthroat, cannibalistic, ruthless competition." These are new phrases coined by those who no longer want to do business under the principles of free and open competition, but, on the other hand, want and are obtaining Government support to violate every principle of commerce which was safeguarded under the Sherman Antitrust Law. Its proponents very softly and smoothly say that all that is asked is that every buyer have an opportunity to purchase at the same price.

Those who further the open-price policy are attempting to justify their position by the argument that the clear marking of prices in the retail trades has helped business ethics tremendously, and that the open-price policy will result in similar benefits by clearly designating the prices at which a manufacturer proposes to sell his goods. This, it is argued, will eliminate many of the unfair trade practices, and therefore justifies the inclusion of this provision in N. R. A. and in codes.

This contention is a pure delusion. There is, of course, no objection to the issuance of catalogs and price lists by business. In fact, in most businesses it is essential that catalogs and price lists be issued. There is no other way of doing business. It is quite another matter, however, to permit the issuance of these catalogs and price lists for interchange with competitors, and then hold the umbrella of law over this practice. In other words, when the Sherman antitrust and other laws are suspended and this practice affirmatively permitted the Sherman Antitrust Law, then obviously the open-price policy will flourish as a means and method of price fixing and price control. It is one thing for individual concerns to issue a price list. It is another thing to have a system under which an organized method of interchange of these price lists takes place with time lags for changes, etc., and with the consent of the Government and the waiver of the antitrust laws.

It sounds idealistic to one not familiar with the principles of trade, and the absolute necessity of a continuation of barter which has always been the underlying basis of the exchange in commodities.

Its purpose is not idealistic or in the public interest. Its purpose and effect are to control prices.

It forms and many times is used as an underlying base for a price-fixing agreement. It makes violators of one law of those who do not violate the Sherman Antitrust Law.

As an illustration of how this plan works in fixing prices if there is a secret and unrecorded agreement between manufacturers in a certain line:

After having reached the agreement in regard to prices, A, generally the largest concern, will issue the first price list. B, C, D, and others will follow suit. Everything is now set and prices have become stabilized. There can no longer be ruthless, cannibalistic, cutthroat, or cave-man competition, at least not so long as the understanding or agreement continues.

The first man who violates this agreement without notifying all of his competitors has violated a Federal law and is subject to pun-

ishment, notwithstanding the fact that by violating one law he is no longer continuing to violate the Sherman Antitrust Law.

The facts are that if the "open-price" plan is honestly adhered to it will greatly intensify competition. What greater factor is there to intensify competition than to always know your competitor's prices? The fact that this is so well known in trade establishments beyond a question of doubt that the purpose of the "open-price" plan is nothing more or less than to bring about price stabilization, another name for price fixing. Even its adherents will admit that this is its purpose, but, as stated before, it does not accomplish that purpose unless there is an underlying agreement, which formerly was prohibited under the Sherman Antitrust Law.

If price fixing is to be tabooed and the principles of free and open competition are to be reestablished, with the Sherman Antitrust Law fully operative, it will be necessary that there be incorporated in any new N. R. A. act not only an affirmative prohibition against price fixing, but also a prohibition which will deny to any branch of industry operating under codes of so-called "fair competition" the right to make mandatory upon all members of that industry the public filing of prices. If the adoption and use of the "open-price" plan is to be permitted at all, it should be allowed only as an individual unit's right and not be made mandatory upon all operating within a given industry.

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE DEEP WATERWAY TREATY

Mr. GIBSON presented resolutions adopted by the Vermont Dairymen's Association, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the ratification of the treaty between the United States and Canada for the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway will be brought before the United States Senate at this session of Congress; and

Whereas the development of the electrical power now going to waste on the St. Lawrence River would result in a lower rate and an increased use of electricity on the farms of Vermont; and

Whereas the lowering of rates for electricity would undoubtedly attract many new manufacturers to this State and thereby create increased employment and a corresponding increase in the demand for farm products; and

Whereas the improvement of navigation on the St. Lawrence River, covered by this treaty, will complete developments from the sea to the head of Lake Superior and is the first step in securing an outlet from Lake Champlain to the St. Lawrence River, for deep-draft steamships; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence Seaway will materially lower freight rates on all commodities and help to maintain a balance between agriculture and industry in Vermont: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Vermont Dairymen's Association respectfully petition United States Senator Austin and United States Senator Gibson to vote in favor of ratification of this treaty; and be it further

Resolved, That the Vermont Dairymen's Association instruct the secretary of this association to forward a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt.

M. H. CAMPBELL,
Chairman Committee on Resolutions.

FEDERAL GASOLINE TAX

Mr. ROBINSON. I present a communication from the director of the National Automobile Dealers Association, with accompanying resolutions, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the communication, with accompanying resolutions, was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PINE BLUFF, ARK., February 21, 1935.

Senator JOSEPH T. ROBINSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBINSON: I have the honor, as a member of the board of directors of the National Automobile Dealers Association, to submit to you, with a request for your support, the attached resolution opposing any further extension or enactment of the existing Federal gasoline tax of 1 cent per gallon.

This resolution has received unanimous adoption by our national executive committee. Being the State director for Arkansas I am sending this to each of our Senators and Representatives in the Congress. Our association president, F. W. A. Vesper, likewise has transmitted it to the President of the United States as well as to the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the United States Senate.

This Federal gasoline tax will expire normally June 30 next. It should be allowed to die. It is highly discriminatory and harmful to the automotive industry in that it acts as a deterrent to the sale and use of motor vehicles—the trade that has taken the leadership in pointing the way to national recovery the last year through a stimulation of automobile sales. Should it not be encouraged to further advance in business, instead of being handicapped further?

This tax was not levied for the maintenance of good roads, but is just another special tax imposed upon motor-vehicle operators for general-fund purposes.

What started to be a temporary, emergency tax, already has cost motorists \$62,839,826.70 during the 6 months it was in effect in 1932, another \$181,125,987.62 in 1933, and \$170,000,000 (estimated) in 1934. The total special additional taxes paid by our unfairly burdened group is more than \$1,000,000,000 per year, which was more than one-eighth of the total tax revenue collected for the Federal Government throughout the entire United States in 1934. (This was in addition to the other taxation to which motor-vehicle owners and dealers paid.)

Despite the struggle of the automotive industry and the dealers' trade in 1934 to increase business, increase production, and increase employment, collections from automotive taxes by the Federal Government in 1934 was 2.1 percent greater than in 1933, according to the National Highway Users Conference.

Taxation on gasoline now totals from 20 to 100 percent of its retail price.

Therefore, it is with confidence in your principles of fair treatment of all citizens alike that I present this resolution to you, expressing as it does the united feeling of our 30,000 dealers and the 25,000,000 car owners who should not be singled out from our population of 122,000,000 people to bear more than one-eighth additional share of the general expense of the Federal Government.

Respectfully yours,

FELIX G. SMART,

Director, National Automobile Dealers Association.

Resolution on the Federal gasoline tax

To all United States Senators and Representatives of the Seventy-fourth Congress:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has levied an emergency Federal tax of 1 cent per gallon on sales of gasoline, the revenues from which are utilized for general-fund purposes; and

Whereas such Federal gasoline tax constitutes a double assessment on motor-vehicle operators, in view of the fact that the 48 States of the United States had already levied State taxes on sales of gasoline when the said Federal gasoline tax was imposed, and such tax is, in fact, an invasion of the rights of the States; and

Whereas the use for general-fund purposes, of the said revenues derived from such Federal gasoline tax, constitutes, in effect, a usurpation and diversion of funds that should rightfully accrue to the States for road construction and maintenance; and

Whereas the assessment of this tax by the Federal Government is highly detrimental to the interests of the States, in that it now tends to make the total gasoline tax in many States prohibitive and is causing in some States diminished returns; and

Whereas contrary to the intent and purpose of the gasoline-tax principle as originally recognized by the States and later subscribed to by the Congress of the United States in the Hayden-Cartwright Act of 1934, the Federal gasoline tax also encourages diversion and evasion of gasoline taxes in the States; and

Whereas revenues from the taxation of gasoline sales were intended properly to belong to the States, for the construction and maintenance of roads and must be restored to them, particularly in view of the necessity for matching future Federal-aid funds, as soon to be provided under the Hayden-Cartwright Act of 1934; and

Whereas for the foregoing reasons, and in view of the fact that the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, the Finance Committee of the Senate, and the Vinson Subcommittee on Double Taxation have each previously recognized the unfairness of the Federal gasoline tax and have stated that it ought to be eliminated; and

Whereas we believe that the said tax should be allowed to expire at the expiration of the present fiscal year, on June 30, 1935, and the taxation of gasoline hereafter left to the States for their exclusive use as a means of providing funds for highways: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the executive committee of the National Automobile Dealers' Association, by mail vote of January 24, 1935, pursuant to the constitution and bylaws of said association, whose membership during the year 1934 totaled 30,000 automobile dealers who are constantly in contact with the 25,000,000 motor-vehicle owners of the United States, said executive committee thereby being in a position to interpret the will not only of the association membership but of the owners of motor vehicles, as well, that the above committees and both Houses of Congress be and hereby are memorialized on behalf of the members of this organization to allow the Federal gasoline tax to expire at the close of the present fiscal year, June 30, 1935, in accordance with the declared intent at the time it was passed; that it be not levied again in any way whatsoever, and that the Federal Government permanently withdraw from the field of gasoline taxation and leave to the States exclusively the power and right to tax gasoline sales in the future; and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives to be laid before the members of the committee, and to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance to be laid before the members of that committee, and, likewise, that the directors of this association be requested to present this resolution with a letter of transmittal, to both Senators from their respective States, and to the Members of the House of Representatives who represent the district under the jurisdiction of each of the directors of this association, urging them to use their

utmost endeavors to carry out our desires as expressed in the letter and spirit of this resolution, and thus afford to our members and all those who operate motor vehicles or are consumers of gasoline, commercially or privately, the greatly needed relief which they demand from an excessive burden of discriminatory taxation due largely to the combined high tax on gasoline in State and Nation.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, NATIONAL
AUTOMOBILE DEALERS' ASSOCIATION,
F. W. A. VESPER, *Chairman*.

Certified to be a true copy of resolution adopted by above executive committee.

J. O. MUNN, *Secretary*.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON:

A bill (S. 2072) for the relief of Robert H. Muirhead; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BYRD:

A bill (S. 2073) to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 2074) to create a National Park Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. CLARK:

A bill (S. 2075) to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the eastern and western districts of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 2076) for the relief of Domenico Politano; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2077) to authorize the presentation of the Distinguished Service Cross to William A. Sullivan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2078) granting a pension to Fred W. Coleman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY:

A bill (S. 2079) for the relief of Samuel Madison Strange; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2080) to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEWIS:

A bill (S. 2081) for the maintenance of aged dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TRUMAN:

A bill (S. 2082) for the relief of Thomas J. Gould; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2083) to provide for appointment of Sgt. Raymond J. Hanna, detached enlisted men's list, United States Army, now serving with Missouri National Guard, a warrant officer, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2084) granting a pension to Mattie Jarrett;

A bill (S. 2085) granting a pension to Lizzie Kennedy;

A bill (S. 2086) granting a pension to Sarah J. Parker; and

A bill (S. 2087) granting an increase of pension to William T. Conley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON (for Mrs. CARAWAY):

A bill (S. 2088) to authorize acquisition of land to provide appropriate means of access to the post-office building at Jonesboro, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROBINSON (for Mr. SMITH):

A bill (S. 2089) for the relief of Otis L. Sims; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2090) to correct the naval record of Carlyle P. Mixon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 2091) granting a pension to Elizabeth H. Geddings; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

A bill (S. 2092) to control flood waters of the Brazos River and its tributaries in the State of Texas, to aid and improve agriculture and industrial development within said river

basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

A bill (S. 2093) granting a pension to Ethel H. Randall (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER:

A bill (S. 2094) to provide funds for cooperation with the school board at Medicine Lake, Mont., in the construction of a public-school building to be available to Indian children of the village of Medicine Lake, Sheridan County, Mont.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 2095) to amend an act entitled "An act to improve the navigability and to provide for the flood control of the Tennessee River; to provide for reforestation and the proper use of marginal lands in the Tennessee Valley; to provide for the agricultural and industrial development of said valley; to provide for the national defense by the creation of a corporation for the operation of Government properties at and near Muscle Shoals in the State of Alabama, and for other purposes", approved May 18, 1933; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 2096) for the relief of W. G. Wertz; and

A bill (S. 2097) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine claims of certain bands or tribes of Indians residing in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2098) granting an increase of pension to Nettie M. Underwood; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 2099) for the relief of David Thygerson; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2100) to amend an act of Congress entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, as amended, by adding three new sections to be numbered 802 (a), 802 (b), and 802 (c), respectively; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 2101) granting a pension to Walter L. Rosasco; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BONE:

A bill (S. 2102) granting a pension to Della Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 2103) to authorize the purchase of existing buildings for governmental use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COSTIGAN:

A bill (S. 2104) to provide for a census of unemployment, occupations, and population; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 2105) to provide for an additional number of cadets at the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2106) to increase the public revenue of the United States of America by amending the Revenue Act of 1932; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2107) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes", approved July 1, 1902, and amendments thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COOLIDGE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 69) to provide for the erection of a suitable memorial to the Fourth Division, American Expeditionary Forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 70) authorizing the erection in Washington, D. C., of a monument in memory of Col. Robert Ingersoll; to the Committee on the Library.

PAYMENT OF ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to reintroduce a joint resolution which I introduced a few days ago and have it referred to the Committee on Finance. It authorizes the President to readjust the debts owing to this Government by the governments of Europe, and to use the proceeds for the discharge of the adjusted-service certificates.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and referred as indicated by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 71) to authorize the President to enter into agreements with foreign governments to readjust the obligations of such governments held by the United States and to secure payments on such readjusted obligations sufficient to pay the adjusted-service certificates now outstanding, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

WORK-RELIEF PROGRAM—AMENDMENT

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the McCarran amendment in the form of an added provision, which I respectfully ask the clerk to read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] proposes to amend the so-called "McCarran amendment" to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) making appropriations for relief purposes by inserting at the proper place the following:

Provided, however, That the President is hereby authorized to examine the facts and determine whether the payment of such prevailing wage in any locality is subversive of the maintenance or recovery of private industry or otherwise detrimental thereto; and in the event that the President finds that the payment of such prevailing wage is so subversive or detrimental and shall issue a proclamation so declaring, then within 10 days thereafter he shall be and is authorized to direct the payment of such scale of wages in such locality as he shall determine.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I am thoroughly convinced that every Member of this body always has been, is now, and will hereafter be in favor of raising the living standards of the workers and the toilers of America.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest to the Senator that before he proceeds with his address the Senate have an opportunity to conclude morning business.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Very well. I yield the floor, as suggested by the Senator from Arkansas, until morning business shall have been concluded.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5221) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act with respect to rice, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion of Mr. NYE, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1468) for the relief of Charles Augustus Lathrop, and it was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REGULATION OF TRAFFIC IN FOOD AND DRUGS—AMENDMENT

Mr. McNARY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 5) to prevent the manufacture, shipment, and sale of adulterated or misbranded food, drink, drugs, and cosmetics, and to regulate traffic therein; to prevent the false advertisement of food, drink, drugs, and cosmetics; and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT—PROCESSING TAX ON RICE

Mr. HAYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5221) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act with respect to rice, and for

other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

MAGGIE THOMAS DAVIS

Mr. TYDINGS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 90), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate, fiscal year 1934, to Maggie Thomas Davis, daughter of William Thomas, late a laborer of the Senate under supervision of the Sergeant at Arms, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PROBLEMS OF GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARKLEY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] at the annual Democratic banquet of Kansas Democrats at Topeka, Kans., February 22, 1935.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Democrats, I am grateful to my friends in Kansas for the cordial invitation which brings me here on the birthday of the Father of his Country to discuss with you some of the problems which confront our people and their Government. It is not easy to depart from Washington during a busy session of Congress with measures of vast importance pending which may affect the welfare of the people for years or decades to come. My excuse for coming to your State, if I need an excuse, is the belief that now and then someone in the midst of the consideration of these great problems in the Congress and in the Capitol ought to take a little time off to bring to the people such message as he may have in discussing intimately and frankly what affects them all.

In the discussion of problems of government, those who occupy positions of political responsibility are too often prone to look at all questions from the standpoint of partisan politics. While I am a lifelong and earnest advocate of the policies of the Democratic Party, I hope I may not be foolish enough to claim that all virtue resides in our bosoms and all evil in the bosoms of our opponents.

As a matter of course I am proud of the history and the accomplishments of American democracy. I am proud that Thomas Jefferson was its father and Andrew Jackson its great pioneer and effective advocate. I am proud that Grover Cleveland emphasized its rugged honesty, and that Woodrow Wilson gave to it a vision which lifted us above the sordid considerations of narrow and selfish individualism and crowned it with something of a mass responsibility.

I am proud that Franklin Roosevelt combines the philosophy of Jefferson, the courage and driving power of Jackson, the rugged honesty of Cleveland, and the broad humanitarian conceptions of Woodrow Wilson.

No man ever assumed the leadership of a nation under circumstances more distressing or discouraging. We had seen our commerce with other nations dwindle from \$10,000,000,000 to little more than two billions. We had seen the smoke of industry fade from the skies and millions of honest God-fearing and hard-working men thrown out of employment and deprived of an opportunity to earn an honest living. We had seen agriculture collapse until the farmers were compelled to produce what feeds and clothes the world for less than the cost of that production. And we had seen the agencies of credit which had been set up for the benefit of agriculture completely cease to perform their expected functions.

We had seen the total collapse of our banking system as evidenced in the failure of more banks in the 4 years prior to the inauguration of Mr. Roosevelt than had failed in all the history of the American Nation, and we had seen more banks fail in the United States in that period than had failed in all the rest of the world.

We had seen State after State declare banking holidays in order to give temporary protection to institutions in which the people had lost their confidence.

And as a result of this we saw the American people losing confidence not only in their economic, industrial, and social structures, but losing confidence in the very political institutions for which they had sacrificed in peace and in war alike. In the midst of this national gloom President Roosevelt took the helm of our ship of state.

I need not undertake in detail to chronicle all of the accomplishments of his administration from March 4, 1933, to this date. And when I say "his administration" I mean not only the executive but the legislative branch of our Government, because no Executive, however wise or powerful, can accomplish much in the field of legislation for recovery without the cordial cooperation of the elected representatives of the people.

The history of our efforts to restore confidence in the banking system is one of the brightest chapters in the history of financial legislation. By a stroke of broadness unequalled the President declared a national banking holiday by closing the banks until they could be reopened under circumstances that would inspire

new confidence among the people. Legislation was enacted providing a new charter for a stronger banking system than has ever existed in the history of the Nation. As part of this new charter Congress undertook to guarantee to practically all of the depositors in all of our banks—State and National—that their deposits would be available when called for.

Under the new legislation and the new guidance of those placed in charge of this vital function of our Government, we have increased our deposits in the past year and a half by more than \$6,000,000,000. The American people now believe in the integrity of their financial institutions.

I have referred to the collapse of the farm credit system which was set up for the benefit of American agriculture during the administration of Woodrow Wilson. Men in and out of Congress, immediately prior to the inauguration of the new deal, doubted whether the farm credit system could ever be restored. For more than a year it had utterly ceased to function. Doleful and pessimistic men preached its funeral in public forum and private drawing room. But before the Roosevelt administration was 6 months old, the farm credit system had taken on new life because it had a new leadership, and all over this Nation it has not only restored its power to function, but it has restored the confidence of the American farmer. Hundreds of thousands of farms have been rescued from the auctioneer, and the morale of the farmer has been restored and preserved.

We found a vast and unsalable agricultural surplus, which rested like a mountain upon the backs of depressed farmers. This unsalable surplus not only added to the aggregate cost of the farmer's production but it depressed the prices of that part of his production for which he found a sale. It was recognized by everybody that unless we could find a market in foreign countries for this unsalable surplus, we could not continue to produce it without disaster to the farmer. Inasmuch as the foreign market for these surpluses had been destroyed by the short-sighted policy of our predecessors, it was necessary to find a way by which to reduce that surplus at least until the American farmer could find a normal market for the products of his fields.

Carping critics may condemn, as they frequently do, that which they do not understand or willfully misrepresent. But the income of the American farmer has been increased during the past 2 years by more than a billion dollars per annum. The prices of his products have increased in some instances by more than 100 percent, and on the average between 50 and 75 percent. The American farmer has seen a new vision. He is thrilled by new hope, and looks forward to the realization of his laudable ambition with the full confidence that his Government, and his elected officers, are bending every possible effort to aid him in the solution of his problems.

One of the greatest difficulties encountered by the new administration in the very beginning was that of the unprecedented unemployment among the able-bodied laboring men and women of the Nation. It was estimated that more than 13,000,000 workers were without employment and were walking the streets in search of work, which they could not obtain. It was estimated by the Secretary of Commerce in the last administration that the loss of our trade with foreign nations had been responsible for the loss of employment by more than 3,000,000 American workingmen. But whatever the cause may have been, and wherever the responsibility lay, these men and women were out of work and it was a task of the first magnitude to attempt to restore them to honest and remunerative toil.

One of the methods by which this was attempted was shortening hours of labor so as to distribute employment among a larger number of employees. Another method was to abolish the curse of American labor—the exploitation of children in the sweatshops of the country for private greed and indefensible gain.

It was realized also that more abuses existed in the industrial and commercial life of the Nation, which could not be abolished except by the cooperation of business and industry themselves, working also with labor and labor's problems.

In order to attempt to solve these correlated questions the National Industrial Recovery Act was passed by Congress and signed by the President. No one would claim that this act was offered, or that it was operated as a panacea for the solution of either industrial, economic, or labor problems; but it is a fact to be noted that nobody offered anything better, either then or since.

It could not have been expected that an act so comprehensive, dealing as it did with the business relationships of millions of our people, could have been administered without some misunderstanding, some friction, and even some injustice. But even those who have criticized it, and still criticize it, not only offer nothing better in its place but actually protest against its discontinuance. In a hearing before the Finance Committee on the question of giving the President the power to negotiate trade agreements with foreign nations many business men appeared to object to the granting of such a power, although it had been frequently granted by our opponents for nearly 75 years. In each instance when these critics and objectors were asked whether they favored the discontinuance of the National Industrial Recovery Act, their reply was in the negative.

While we may find some injustices, which may have come about by the administration of this act, on the whole it has served the interests of American business and of American labor. Whether we give credit to this act or some other act, or a combination of acts, the role of the unemployed has been reduced from 13,000,000 to seven or eight millions of people. On the average, the American wage scale has increased. Shorter hours of labor have been provided for the American laboring men and

thousands of our children have been freed from the sweatshops to enter the portals of schools and playgrounds.

We are now engaged in the effort by additional legislation to preserve what has been found helpful in the National Industrial Recovery Act, and to discard what has been found unwise or impracticable. And this program commends itself to American business and to American labor, as well as to all classes of our people.

There has been an endless dispute raging among the American people ever since October 1929 as to whether the collapse in the stock market caused the depression, or whether the shadow of an approaching depression caused the collapse in the stock market. I have neither the time nor the inclination to enter into a discussion of this mooted question. But we do know that prior to that date, Americans of all classes were encouraged to forsake the ordinary pursuits of industry and of labor to try their hand at the wheel of fortune. Prices for securities that had no foundation in the condition of the concerns these securities represented were pyramided by the speculative mania which was openly encouraged by those occupying the highest political positions in the Nation.

During that hectic period when securities for a few days at a time would tend to decline, the then Secretary of the Treasury would fulminate from the Treasury Building to the effect that stocks were not yet high enough and that there was no just reason for not expecting or desiring that they should go higher. And when the optimistic prognostications of the head of the Treasury did not operate to turn the tide back toward speculative inflation, the President himself, on more than one occasion, gave oral and written encouragement to the speculating mania.

As a result millions of people lost the savings of a lifetime, and paper values never justified by actual conditions collapsed so fundamentally and carried with that a train of evil events so disastrous as to destroy nearly half the paper value of all securities held by the American people. In an effort to protect the people of the Nation from such a disaster in the future, we have provided for Government supervision of the issue of securities and their sale upon the exchanges of the country, and those who during the process of legislation, condemned these regulations as unwarranted, now hail them as wise and proper measures of protection to the American investor.

As a result of the terrific conditions which have existed for the past 5 years, the question of relief for unemployment has been uppermost in the minds of men in private and in public life. Prior to the arrival of the present depression, charity and public relief for the most part, were dispensed by private organizations, or by local government in the community where it was needed. I need not discuss whether a reversal of this policy could have been avoided by the assumption of greater local responsibility, but the President and Congress were soon confronted with the dilemma of permitting American men, women, and children to starve by the wholesale, or bringing the agencies of the Federal Government to their rescue by the expenditure of public funds. There was only one answer to this dilemma. If cities and counties and States had exhausted their means of taxation, or their revenue-raising powers, and were still deficient in meeting the human needs, the Federal Government could not close its eyes to the situation. Even if local authorities did not exert their full authority in the raising of local funds, likewise the Nation could not ignore its obligations. Men, women, and children could not be left to the tender mercies of the elements and refused the comforts of food, shelter, and of clothing. We could not in this Nation of theoretical, if not actual plenty, brought about by any possible maldisposition and maladjustment of our economic system, permit men, women, and children to die of hunger or exposure.

This obligation, recognized by the Nation as a national problem, has been a great burden upon our financial resources. It is and will be a continued burden until normal conditions have returned and private industry has been able to absorb unemployment and private and local agencies of relief are able to resume this burden. In his message to Congress in January, the President laid before us what seems to be a constructive and far-sighted program of work and relief. We are now debating in Congress whether we shall appropriate nearly \$5,000,000,000 for work and relief or shall abandon work altogether and appropriate \$2,000,000,000 for relief. We are debating whether we shall take men off the rolls of charity and at a wage which will enable them to live in decency, enroll them in a program of constructive work and permanently add to the value and the wealth of the Nation. We are debating whether in order to get men off of the rolls of charity we shall employ them on public or other works, at rates of pay equal to the rates of wage paid by private industry. It seems to me there is but one answer to this question. We cannot afford to place the Government in competition with private industry by offering a wage so attractive that men will desert private industry to become enrolled on Government pay rolls. At the same time, we ought to pay a wage sufficiently high to induce men to leave the rolls of charity to become enrolled among those who are earning what they receive at the hands of the Federal Government.

We have criticized and are being criticized by those who have no program of their own because these great agencies of the National Government have for the time unbalanced our Budget.

All of us would be glad if each year and each month our National Budget could be balanced, just as we would be delighted if our personal budgets could be balanced. But there has never been a great crisis in the national history involving large and unusual expenditures when the Federal Budget could be balanced.

It was not balanced during the Civil War. It was not balanced during the depression of 1873. It was not balanced during the depression of 1893. It was certainly not balanced during the great World War. During that great struggle, which lasted, so far as we were concerned, for only 19 months, we expended more than \$30,000,000,000, raised by taxation and by the sale of Liberty bonds. That was an amount greater than the total cost of the National Government from the Declaration of Independence in 1776 to the time of the declaration of war against Germany in 1917. While that expenditure from our standpoint as a nation was justified, it involved the destruction of billions of dollars' worth of property and hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of human lives.

We have been compelled during recent years to unbalance our national budget. We have increased the national debt by seven or eight billions of dollars, but my friends, let us bear in mind that not a dollar of this money has been expended to destroy a single home, nor a single piece of property, that has been accumulated by the toll and sweat of an American citizen. Not a dollar of it has been expended to sniff out a single human life born of woman in this or any other Nation. While I voted as a Member of Congress to enter the World War, and voted for every measure put forward to win it hastily and completely, I would rather spend \$1,000,000 to save American lives and American property, than to vote for a single dollar to destroy them here, or elsewhere, in the world. We do not have to apologize for our efforts to preserve the lives and the property of the American people, or to restore and maintain their high morale as free and independent citizens of the world's greatest Nation.

These are but a few of the deeds we have accomplished and are seeking to accomplish. We could not expect to carry forth a great humanitarian program without opposition and condemnation among the short-sighted, or the reactionaries. George Washington had to fight a similar element to gain American independence. Thomas Jefferson had to fight a similar element to obtain the rights of democracy for the American people, and Andrew Jackson met the same type of opposition in his fight against entrenched privilege. Abraham Lincoln was confronted at every step by critic and denouncer, by the forsaker and by the intellectual superior who arrogated to himself all wisdom and all knowledge, and condemned Lincoln because he came forward and represented the great body of the common people. But in spite of opposition and bitter condemnation, George Washington established the Nation. Thomas Jefferson established a democracy, Andrew Jackson proclaimed it to the common man, and Abraham Lincoln preserved the Union and became the Nation's greatest martyr. Likewise, Woodrow Wilson fought the forces of reaction in bringing a new freedom into the lives of the American people, inspired by the same fundamental conceptions of public responsibility. Guided by the same providential hand, I predict that Franklin D. Roosevelt, acclaimed today as the hope of the Nation without regard to party, color, or religion, will take his place among those who have given and have preserved the rights, the privileges, and the hopes of millions of people here and throughout the world.

We have not sought and are not seeking to destroy individual liberty. Every man who enjoys civilized society must surrender something that might be deemed an original liberty in order that organized society may live. But in so doing, he acquires a greater and a more lasting freedom, the freedom to live under law and under the protection of the Government; the freedom to work and support his family; the freedom to educate his children; the freedom to enjoy all of the necessities and some of comforts and luxuries of life; the freedom to travel now and then to see something of the beauties of God's great world; the freedom to vote and to have a voice in his Government; the freedom to be unhampered by the strong or the powerful through the agencies of protection given to him by a just and an honest Government.

I challenge those who complain that we have robbed the people of their liberties to point to a single instance where they have lost any liberty which they should have retained. I challenge those who criticize everything we have done to tell us what they would have done if the people had placed responsibility in their hands instead of ours. I challenge them to give us a bill of particulars, containing what they ever proposed, or what they now propose, as a substitute for what we are attempting to do to rescue the American people.

Do they condemn us for restoring American agriculture, for preserving the farmer's home and his confidence in his country? Do they condemn us for strengthening and revitalizing our financial institutions? Do they condemn us for providing a way by which the small-home owner in towns and cities could preserve his hearthstone and his little family? Do they condemn us for seeking to find an outlet for our surplus products through the markets of the world? Do they condemn us for feeding the hungry? Do they condemn us for abolishing child labor? Do they condemn us for seeking to spread labor among a larger number of people by shortening the hours of labor?

Do they condemn us for seeking a form of insurance against the hazards of unemployment among the Nation's workers in the future? Do they condemn us for seeking to diminish the hazards of old age by attempting to provide a reasonable and workable old-age pension for those who have served their day and generation without adequate financial remuneration? Do they condemn us for seeking to conduct the Government on such a basis as to guarantee a larger measure of justice and of opportunity to the underprivileged classes of our people, many of whom have been made underprivileged because others have been overprivileged?

under laws and under policies heretofore in operation. Do those who condemn the "new deal" hope to reinaugurate the "old deal", which was essentially a raw deal? If so, let them say so openly and not slip up on the American people from the rear and seek to administer a blow while they are not looking.

As I stated at the outset, we do not claim a monopoly of virtues or wisdom. Neither do we attribute to our opponents a monopoly of folly or of evil, but the American people are overwhelmingly convinced that Franklin D. Roosevelt and those who are working with him, whether they be Democrats, Progressives, or Republicans, have been and are putting forward a superhuman effort to lift the American people and the American Nation out of the bogs of despondency and of hopelessness, and place them upon a firm foundation of equity, of equality, of justice, and of public service, which will enable them to enjoy the fruits of their labors and to enjoy a fair share of our natural resources and opportunities.

In behalf of such a consummation, we summon not only the hosts of democracy, whom you and I in part represent, but we invite the sympathetic and constructive cooperation of all Americans without regard to political, religious, or economic convictions, whose chief desire in life is to serve the cause of popular government and of popular rights.

NARCOTIC DRUG EVIL

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the radio broadcast of Mr. Hayne Davis, vice president of the Narcotic Association for Official Cooperation; Hon. Charles Curtis, of Kansas; and Hon. Key Pittman, of Nevada, January 23, 1935, relative to the narcotic-drug evil and the necessity of the States of our Union acting with respect to the matter while their legislatures are in session at the present time.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The announcer of the National Broadcasting Co. said:

"This is the first of a series of broadcasts under the auspices of the World Narcotic Defense Association, of which Admiral Richmond P. Hobson is president. This association has its headquarters in New York City and devotes itself to protection of the people in every possible way against the narcotic-drug evil. The arrests made last December for violation of existing narcotic laws throughout the entire country, totaling nearly 1,000 in 1 week, gave some evidence of the extent of this evil, and at the same time disclosed grave defects in the narcotic laws of the States.

"For the curing of these defects, and for enabling the United States to fulfill all its treaty obligations on narcotics and to achieve a maximum of service to mankind through cooperation with the nations in combating this evil in its international aspects, the Narcotic Association is now carrying on a comprehensive campaign to secure adoption by all the States of the Union of a uniform law on narcotics. The National and Columbia Broadcasting Cos. have tendered their assistance by donating five periods for broadcasts in aid of this campaign. Eminent authorities have consented to assist by making use of the time thus made available.

"The speakers at these broadcasts are Hon. Charles Curtis, former Vice President of the United States; Hon. Key Pittman, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Hon. Royal S. Copeland, United States Senator from New York; Hon. James J. Davis, United States Senator from Pennsylvania; Hon. Morris Sheppard, United States Senator from Texas; Hon. James E. Watson, former United States Senator from Indiana; Hon. Scott M. Loflin, of Florida, president of American Bar Association; Hon. Clarence E. Martin, of West Virginia, former president of American Bar Association; Mr. H. J. Anslinger, United States Commissioner of Narcotics; Mrs. Grace Morrison Poole, president of General Federation of Women's Clubs; Mrs. Ida B. Wise Smith, president of Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

"Mr. Hayne Davis, vice president of the World Narcotic Defense Association, will conduct the broadcasts on behalf of the Narcotic Association."

Mr. Hayne Davis, vice president of the Narcotic Association, said:

"The former Vice President of the United States, Hon. Charles Curtis, of Kansas, was presiding over the Senate when the narcotic treaty of 1931 was ratified in March 1932. He is so well known to the American people it would not do to say, as the custom is, 'I now introduce him', but I do take pleasure in saying that the former Vice President will now address you. Mr. Curtis."

ADDRESS OF HON. CHARLES CURTIS

Fellow citizens, on March 4, 1932, the following message was sent to the Senate of the United States by the then President.

"I transmit herewith a convention for limiting the manufacture and regulating the distribution of narcotic drugs, dated July 13, 1931, and signed by the Representatives of the United States of America and 43 other countries represented at the conference for the limitation of the manufacture of narcotic drugs. In view of the benefit which would accrue to the United States from the ratification of the convention as set forth in the accompanying report of the Secretary of State, and the report of the delegates of the United States to the conference, to both of which the attention of the Senate is invited, and because of the deep interest taken in the United States in the humanitarian aspect of

the provisions of the document, I strongly commend the convention to the favorable consideration of the Senate and request their advice and consent to ratification of the convention.

"(Signed) HERBERT HOOVER."

The report of the then Secretary of State, Mr. Stimson, referred to in this message from the President, said among other things:

"The principal problem of narcotic-law enforcement in the United States is that of preventing the unlawful introduction of narcotic drugs. It is foreign overproduction which supplies the illicit international traffic. The domestic manufacture of the drugs in the United States is limited so closely to the medical needs of the country that diversion of the home-manufactured product is comparatively negligible and the illicit traffic finds its source of supply in drugs which are smuggled in from abroad. Recent enforcement activities of the newly created Federal Narcotic Bureau, in conjunction with other governmental agencies, have produced gratifying results in curbing the unlawful introduction of narcotics into the country, but it needs no argument to establish the advantage to the United States which would follow from the control of the traffic at the source through the elimination of overproduction. This the convention under discussion is designed to accomplish. If it is made effective and enforced by the high contracting parties, it may confidently be expected to reduce to the amounts needed for medical and scientific purposes the quantities of these dangerous substances manufactured.

"It is in view of these advantages that the delegation strongly recommends that the treaty be ratified. Ratification by this Government will no doubt have a strongly persuasive effect in bringing about ratification on the part of countries which, for some reason, may doubt whether the treaty will eventually become effective. Ratification by the United States will add the weight of this country's cooperation toward insuring the effectiveness of the convention. The extent to which the convention is adopted as an obligation by the powers of the world will be the measure of the benefit which may be confidently expected to accrue to the United States through the resultant restriction of the flow of contraband drugs which is an inevitable result of overproduction.

"(Signed) HENRY L. STIMSON."

On the 30th day of March 1932, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations made a report to the Senate recommending the ratification of this treaty, and it was ratified on the following day. Senator BORAH, of Idaho, was chairman of the committee which recommended ratification. The vote on the resolution was unanimous. So that in March 1932 there was no difference of opinion among the constituted authorities of the Nation on this important question. And there is no difference of opinion among us now on this question. We are all agreed that this treaty is for the best interests of all our people in every State of the Union.

I shall repeat, in order to properly emphasize it, one part of the report made to the President in March 1932 by the then Secretary of State, Mr. Stimson:

"Ratification by this Government will no doubt have a strongly persuasive effect in bringing about ratification on the part of countries which, for some reason, may doubt whether the treaty will eventually become effective."

"The extent to which the convention is adopted as an obligation by the powers of the world will be the measure of the benefit which may be confidently expected to accrue to the United States through the resultant restriction of the flow of contraband drugs, which is an inevitable result of overproduction."

The early action on this treaty by the United States—only 2 weeks after its ratification by Nicaragua, the first of all countries to ratify—did in fact have influence in securing favorable action by the requisite number of nations on or before the day fixed, and the number has now risen to 52. Only a dozen nations have not taken action so far.

The benefits expected to accrue to the United States were stated by the United States delegates to the narcotic conference and by Secretary of State Stimson, to be in proportion to the extent to which the treaty would be adopted as an obligation by the nations. The benefits are therefore great, according to this forecast. They have been found very great in actual experience. For nearly all the nations have now ratified and are effectively carrying out the terms of this treaty. As an instance, consider what was stated by Secretary Hull in a broadcast, similar to this one, in July of last year:

"Furthermore, it is a pleasure to express the appreciation of the American Government for the energetic and effective steps which the Turkish Government has taken to suppress the illicit traffic in morphine from Turkey, which only a few years ago had assumed such alarming proportions. The United States was the principal victim of this traffic, and the action taken by the Turkish Government to put an end to it has been of the greatest assistance to the American Government in its efforts to combat the evil of narcotic-drug addiction.

"Turning from the steps which Turkey has taken to make the opium and drug conventions effective in her territories, I venture to call your attention to the fact that certain further steps remain to be taken here in the United States to carry out the requirements of these conventions.

"In meeting the obligations of the United States under the opium and drug conventions the Federal Government is obliged to look to the various States of the Union for help, as under our

Constitution certain of the legislation needed to implement these treaties can be enacted only by the State legislatures. The proposed uniform State narcotic-drug act was drafted by the conference of commissioners on uniform State laws and has received the approval of the American Bar Association and has been recommended for passage by the house of delegates of the American Medical Association. Various provisions have been embodied in this proposed uniform State statute on narcotics, with a view of carrying out obligations of the United States, under the Hague opium convention of 1912 and the narcotics limitation convention of 1931. This act is expected to come before a number of State legislatures for consideration at their coming sessions, and it is hoped that the importance of these provisions will not be overlooked.

"(Signed) CORDELL HULL.

"JULY 9, 1934."

Secretary Stimson was right in 1932 in his forecast of the benefits to accrue to this country through general acceptance of the treaty of 1931. These benefits are great. Secretary Hull is right now.

To get the full benefit for the American people from ratification of this treaty by our country, and by nearly all other countries, the States must adopt the proposed uniform narcotic-drug act, or its equivalent. Nine States have already done so. Through adoption of this act by all the 35 State legislatures now in session another great advance will be made in the crusade against the narcotic-drug evil. Needed protection for the people of each State will be supplied here at home. The hands of the National Government will be properly upheld by the States in its fulfillment of its proper part in combating this evil in its international aspect.

As presiding officer of the Senate at the time this narcotic treaty was ratified, I am glad to take part in the campaign to secure adoption of the uniform narcotic-drug act by the several States. This is clearly for the good of the people of each and every State and for the good of the United States in its cooperation with other nations in the international concert for the general welfare of all people, and I hope the several States will enact the necessary legislation.

"(Signed) CHARLES CURTIS.

Mr. Hayne Davis, vice president of the Narcotic Association, said:

"The Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, Hon. KEY PITTMAN, like the former Vice President, is too well known to be introduced to an American audience, but it is appropriate for me to say that he was in the Senate in March 1932 and voted for ratification of the treaty of 1931. He can speak, therefore, for his sixty-odd colleagues who voted with him for that treaty and who still represent their respective States in the United States Senate; and besides that, Nevada is Senator PITTMAN'S State and Nevada was the first of all our States to adopt the uniform narcotic-drug act, March 1933.

"It is altogether fitting, therefore, that Senator PITTMAN should unite today with the former Vice President of the United States in sounding a clarion call to the 35 States whose legislatures are now in session to rally around 9 States which have already adopted this act, and so to achieve interstate accord on narcotics as international accord has been achieved through ratification of the narcotic treaty of 1931 by more than 50 political subdivisions of the world. Mr. PITTMAN."

ADDRESS OF HON. KEY PITTMAN

My friends, I have had the pleasure of listening to a part of the address of my friend, the ex-Vice President of the United States. He has covered very largely this subject. What I may say must be largely extemporaneous. I know, however, that you will agree with me that there is no subject, there is no problem, more vital than this. In these times, when there is poverty and distress, when there is crime, when murder is a business, we must think. The narcotic problem has been with us for years. Patriotic men have given their lives to it. The ex-Vice President and myself have been students of the subject for years, but not as long as others have. We are trying to meet it; we are going to meet it.

I think that it will be admitted that most of the crime in this country comes from those who are abnormal, those who have degenerated by reason of narcotics. We speak of Dillinger and crimes of that type—they are not natural to our country; they didn't exist once. We do not have to go into the effects of narcotics—that has been talked for years gone by.

What do we want? We want action. We are entitled to action. There are 35 legislatures in session or about to be convened in session. Their action is necessary; it is the duty of the Governors to call to the attention of these legislatures the act that has been already passed by a number of States.

Now, may I briefly give you the history so far as we have gone? It has been given largely by Mr. Curtis, the ex-Vice President, with whom I had the honor to serve in the Senate. On July 9, 1934, at the celebration of the first anniversary of the going into operation of the Narcotic Limitations Treaty of 1931, the Turkish Ambassador and the Secretary of State of the United States made statements in striking contrast, substantially as follows. After reading the remarkable message sent by President Kemal, of Turkey, for broadcasting at that celebration the Ambassador, Mehmet Munir Bey, said that legal measures are now in operation in Turkey in perfect accord with the treaty obligations assumed by that nation.

Secretary Hull of the United States, on the other hand, said in substance that such legal measures are not in operation in our country and cannot be until the several States enact legislation needed to accomplish this purpose, and that under our Constitution only the States are empowered to enact such legislation. May I say to you that Turkey, which supplied most of the opium of the world, whose people made a living out of it, under the leadership of their great President Mustafa Kemal, stopped producing the opium poppy and hemp! The difference between the legal situation in Turkey and the United States is all the more striking when it is remembered that the United States took the initiative in 1909 for securing international accord on narcotics by proposing the first International Narcotic Conference ever held. This fact was graciously referred to by the Turkish Ambassador at the very outset, and it was just in July of last year that President Kemal, at the celebration on that day, referred to the American initiative.

My friends, we have had international action on this matter. We have Turkey, which was the chief supplier of narcotics that intoxicated and dissipated the mentality of the world, to really take the first step and stop the production of narcotics.

We have a treaty among nations to limit its production to medical needs, to limit its export, to limit its import, to limit its sale. We are now calling on the States of our Union to pass the laws which seem essential to entire protection in this matter. It has been a wonderful victory, a remarkable victory, a victory in the sense that people who made their living off of this unfortunate misuse of narcotics were practically the first to stop its production. We who understand its ravages, we who understand that it is unfortunately too often the foundation for crime, crime among the young, we who understand these things are participating in this campaign to secure needed narcotic legislation. Our National Government has participated as far as it may under the Constitution, and we are calling today, we are calling seriously and earnestly upon every Governor in every State in this Union, and upon every legislator, to act. After long, long fights the leaders of this movement in our country, who are known to you too well for me to repeat, have understood that narcotics is the foundation of the digression in our civilization, which has resulted in so much crime. We are calling on you as Governors of these States, we are calling on you as legislators, to act.

I am proud, I am proud to say that my State—Nevada—was the first to enact the general statute agreed upon by the Commissioners on Uniform State Laws for protection against the misuse of narcotics.

These are the States which have already adopted this act: Nevada, March 1933; Florida, May 1933; New York, May 1933; New Jersey, June 1933; Virginia, March 1934; Rhode Island, April 1934; South Carolina, April 1934; Kentucky, June 1934; Louisiana, December 1934.

Where are the other 35 States? They will act in the next 60 days, and we have every confidence how they will act.

In concluding the broadcast Mr. Davis said:

"Every citizen of the United States who is listening to this broadcast is represented in the legislature of his State by two persons—a member of the senate and a member of the lower house.

"You can call upon your representatives in the State legislature to enact the proposed uniform narcotic-drug act. This act, or its equivalent, should be enacted at the present session of the legislatures of 35 States. You can assist in bringing to pass this 'consummation devoutly to be wished.' Grasp this opportunity.

"You can also write to Narcotic Association, 578 Madison Avenue, New York City, or in care of station to which you are listening. Enclose a stamped envelop (any size), addressed to yourself, and you will receive interesting and useful literature on narcotics, which will enable you to participate continuously in a small or large way, according to your circumstances, in this world-wide crusade against one of the worst enemies of mankind."

THE NEW DEAL—ARTICLE BY DONALD R. RICHBERG

MR. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I ask that a brief article, entitled "The Challenge of Tomorrow," published in the magazine *Real Life*, from the pen of Mr. Donald R. Richberg, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The challenge of tomorrow is essentially the challenge to face facts—not as they were, or as they might have been, but as they are.

Of course, this is easily said; and many people honestly and sincerely believe they are facing facts as they are when they are only facing facts as they once were. Without laying claim to any special knowledge or insight, I have sought in the past, and I am seeking now, to see things free from illusions and prejudice, and to keep in mind that what is true today may not be true tomorrow.

What are the objectives of the new deal? There is no secret or mystery about this. Broadly speaking, the new deal is trying to end the chaos in American industrial and agricultural life. That is not a hard definition to understand.

For example, the new deal is seeking to restore a sound banking system; it is seeking to coordinate and balance industry and agriculture to the end that they may stand on their own feet; and, above and beyond all, it is seeking to restore economic security to those millions of Americans who are today without it.

Is that an ambitious program? Perhaps. But as the President of the United States has said, "We are on our way." There can be no turning back.

What is the alternative? Shall we return to the economic jungle of the past? Are we going to junk all those instrumentalities that have been built up through the past to correct disorder and injustice in the economic world? Or shall we continue to improve them?

There are those who complain about Government interference in business. One would assume that these people must believe in a philosophy of everybody for himself and the devil take the hindmost.

As a matter of fact, they do not. They believe in some Government interference in business. If they are small business men and farmers, they believe that the Government ought to regulate the railroads. This was begun in 1887. Business men, big or small, would not like to see that regulation taken away. Many of these same business men and farmers believe in Government sponsorship and development of waterways.

Why? Because they want lower freight rates, and so they are willing to put the Government in that business.

Others wish to see the Government in the shipping business, building a merchant marine; others want more Government canals and highways; others advocate more and more regulation of banking. Almost everyone is willing to have the Government interfere to destroy an evil from which he is suffering, or to give him a lift.

It was, indeed, an excessive faith in so-called "rugged individualism" (in this modern age when a life of rugged individualism had become impossible for the great mass of people) which produced the chaos in which we floundered until the leadership of President Roosevelt brought about a new deal.

The old theory essentially was that those who were willing to work would always eat. It assumed that those who starved, or who lived on little or nothing, suffered because they were lazy or incompetent. Some people even believe that today. They take no account of those who want to work, who want to support themselves and their families, but can find no means of doing so.

And so the Federal Government has mobilized our national energies to end this condition. These are not mere words. This has been done. The improved prices of agricultural products, the rising business turnover, and the millions of workers who have been reemployed are facts. And the future holds the promise that the progress already achieved will continue.

Great progress has been made toward eliminating child labor; slum elimination has at least been started; agriculture has been generally organized for self-help; the banking system has been restored to public health and confidence; we have ceased foolish efforts to support foreign debtors by loaning them more money; the financial pressure on millions of citizens and private concerns has been relieved; and business men, farmers, and workers are being organized for self-help and to insure fair competition.

In these first 2 years of reconstruction, the foundations have been laid for a political-economic system wherein private enterprise can compete for individual profit and at the same time cooperate to maintain a proper balance between the interests of agriculture, trade, industry, management, labor, and consumer. If the private managers of our financial and industrial institutions are ready and willing to build a new industrial structure on these foundations, now is their opportunity.

Let us look at these opportunities.

We have, for example, a vast need in this country for better housing. Millions of new homes can be built with the ample material and labor available. There is plenty of credit which could be employed to finance this construction. And there is plenty of man power.

Further, there are millions of workers who are now able, or would be able, to lease or buy these homes. Production—whether it is of automobiles, radios, moving pictures, whatnot—enriches the lives and fortunes of all the people.

I believe profoundly that the rebuilding of the homes of America will make for a far greater advance of our civilization than any other one development.

But is this all of the picture?

Decidedly not. There are other ways of employing man power and reviving the economic resources of all the people. Millions of workers and billions of dollars could be profitably employed in the next 10 years replacing obsolete machinery and improving the mechanisms of production and transportation. By these methods, more necessities and greater comforts could be distributed to more people than ever before.

That is the way our civilization advances.

There are those today who say that private initiative is too weak, and private capital too timid, to carry us forward. We are solemnly told that management and labor will not cooperate, that both lack the necessary vision.

I do not believe that the courage and energies of American business men and financiers have been exhausted in the last few years. For example, in the growth and development of the N. R. A. we witnessed day after day, week after week, month after month, the vigor with which all the elements of our industrial life responded to an opportunity for self-service combined with public service.

The choice before us is here and now:

We must bring about the employment of four or five million workers in the near future, either through a private expansion of private enterprise, or through further governmental activities. To every home and fireside in America this problem is a real one.

The President is attacking the unemployment problem all along the line, and the Nation is determined to help him win this fight.

It is cruel and short-sighted to argue that the Government ought to cut down its relief expenditures to the smallest dole that will possibly keep alive the idle workers and their families. That cannot be the program of those of us who want to fulfill our obligations to our fellowmen.

Said a stiff-necked friend to me the other day: "I never thought it was the business of government to provide a man with a job."

This attitude rises out of the economics of a bygone age. I reminded my friend that when we deprive a fellow citizen of an opportunity to work, from whatever cause, we are in all essential respects depriving him of his liberty.

The Constitution of the United States is an instrument primarily designed to protect and advance human liberty in these United States. That is its fundamental purpose.

The guaranties of liberty in the Constitution must be translated by any government under that Constitution into guaranties of an opportunity to earn a living by honest, respectable labor, if they are to be effective guaranties of human freedom.

There is nothing startling about this.

The freedom of those of us who live in the cities today, as well as most of those who live on the farms, depends on our ability to exchange the things which we make for the many products of our fellow men. This freedom, which we all crave, must then be guaranteed today—not by letting people alone, but by making sure that they are so organized for cooperative action that the continuous interchange of necessary products and services will not break down and leave hosts of people theoretically free but practically deprived of freedom to earn a living.

This is the challenge of tomorrow and the essential meaning of the new deal, as I understand it. We are all bound together in one common fabric, and the unemployment from which we are suffering today is primarily a social problem. It cannot be relieved by individual effort. It calls for collective planning and concerted action.

I am not a state socialist. I believe that state control of industry means the death of individual liberty. I am one of those who believe that the willing workers of our industrial and commercial world should be able to rely on private enterprise for their continuous support. Most of us recognize the dangers that lie in even a temporary assumption of part of this responsibility by the Government.

But when private enterprise fails to maintain this fundamental guarantee of liberty for millions of our fellow citizens, the Government cannot shirk its ultimate responsibility.

Let us realize that in less than 2 years, under the masterly leadership of President Roosevelt, the Government has fulfilled its first and second obligations:

It has provided relief. And it has mobilized private business and strengthened the foundations of private enterprise. But either private enterprise must now reemploy the idle or the Government must meet its final obligation to see to it that all its able-bodied citizens have the opportunity to earn a living.

Critics of the N. R. A. have made much out of the difficulty of establishing satisfactory standards of fair competition.

I confess that, despite 7 years of university training and a lifelong study of economic questions, I cannot speak with the assurance of those who advise us just how human affairs could be wisely managed if human beings would stop acting like human beings. Having practiced law for over 30 years in behalf of business men, labor organizations, and public bodies, and having had 17 months' experience in the N. R. A., I hope, however, I can qualify as a graduate of the school of hard knocks.

In this capacity I would assert that no process of lawmaking or codification should be expected to establish immediately a fair competitive system.

But it can do this—and that is what I regard as profoundly important—it can provide the basis for a gradual improvement in the conditions under which business men compete with each other and employers and employees struggle to reap separate benefits from common gains.

It is this educational process that has made the N. R. A. a milestone in human progress.

Of course, there have been tremendous difficulties.

The greatest of these, perhaps, was the attempt to accomplish too much in too short a time.

Since June 1933 many theories of business regulation were tried out. Many of these were heartily opposed by academic advisers who had both brains and common sense.

Some of these experiments in certain lines of business proved successful. Some were not. But they were all educational.

The choice must ultimately be presented to industry. It will be forced to choose between a competitive system and a system of controls which may in the long run destroy that competitive system.

Managers and labor leaders who believe devoutly in freedom of contract, collective bargaining, and fair competition should hesitate long before devising legislative controls of their affairs. They may find too late that they have put their own necks into a noose that will strangle them.

In the same way, rigid rules of business practice may appear to be wise to those upon whom they rest lightly, but they may impose unjustified hardship on others. The question of the justice or injustice of the alleged hardship is the issue at stake.

Most business men may approve in principle of fixing minimum wages and maximum hours. But what should be minimum wages and maximum hours is not an academic question; it is a practical one.

The rules adopted should be flexible enough to fit actual conditions. They should not be regarded as the last word on the subject. They should be left subject to improvement by collective bargaining. They should protect the interests of employers and employees and the general public.

Of one thing we may feel certain: So long as the Government confines its efforts in the regulation of business to the preservation of fair competition, the rewards of industry will flow with reasonable steadiness to those who perform social services of corresponding value. But it is equally clear that we cannot establish theoretical standards of what are fair wages or prices or property values. All history teaches us, and every political economist knows, that there are no reliable measuring rods available for such a judgment.

You might, for example, make a good guess as to what is relatively a fair wage for one worker or a fair price for one article. But if you undertook, as a Government official, to fix fair wages for all workers and fair prices for all goods and services you would find it necessary to plan and control the economic destiny and development of the Nation in accordance with some arbitrary theory of the purpose and direction of all human progress.

We cannot undertake to end all inequalities of fortune and to establish unvarying economic and social justice. We can only establish rules of fair play that can be changed from time to time as new occasions teach new duties.

Our industrial civilization is only 50 years old. In that space of time, organized groups have devoted themselves persistently to obtaining special advantages through the use of political power.

They have used property laws, patent laws, tariff acts, regulatory laws, and even the control of natural resources as aids in a competitive struggle dominated far too often by unscrupulous, greedy, and cruel men, who set the rules of a game which high-minded and generous men have been forced to play, or lose their all.

These conditions were the background of the National Industrial Recovery Act.

Long before 1929 it became obvious that the old system must be transformed—that, in fact, the rules of industrial competition must be rewritten and made a part of the law of the land so that honest, humane, and fair business practices could be established as the basis of a new economic era.

But for 3 years after 1929 we waited in vain for an enlightened, aggressive leadership. During those 3 years I attended many a conference of ownership and management and labor. Out of each conference came the same conclusion: The President himself must take command of a national movement or it could not be successful.

Finally, in the spring of 1933 there came into office a President who was willing to assume the responsibility, and whose inaugural address of courage and confidence electrified the Nation.

For the privilege of serving under such leadership I am profoundly grateful. Of course, any constructive program invites criticism, and personal attacks on public officials are the easiest and most useless form of criticism.

For example, I don't see any good served by a newspaper cartoon which shows me carrying a red flag and describes me as a Socialist, when I have a consistent record of having all my life bitterly opposed the theories and programs of state socialism. But I have learned that only a small part of the misrepresentation of public officials is deliberate and malicious. Most of it simply springs from an honest misunderstanding or difference of opinion as to the best method of accomplishing a common purpose.

It is hard not to be impatient with unfair criticisms and misrepresentations of the policies and purposes of the national administration. But I have tried also to realize that many men, confused and uncertain as to what was actually being done, or what were the objects of the Government, were honestly in fear of the destruction of liberty by public officials who were in fact just as honestly doing all in their power to preserve our constitutional liberties.

If, however, we are going to seek a better understanding, we must not lose sight of the driving necessity which has forced our Government, first, into sweeping measures of emergency relief, and second, into their continuance, until we are able to work out some measures of permanent reconstruction in our political and economic system so that our free institutions and our individual freedom and security may be safeguarded against a return to economic chaos.

In this day, when there are still millions of unemployed, when it would be all too easy for us to lose our forward momentum and to start another national slide downhill, no program could be more suicidal than to abandon our new mechanisms of cooperation and to let nature take its ruthless course. It is a time for sober analysis of the gains and losses and the strength and weakness of our cooperative efforts. We must continue them, and we must improve them. There is no patent medicine that will cure our economic ills.

Now we are in the period of a definite business recovery. The time is ripe for a permanent advance in business conditions and labor relations. Skeptics will hesitate, stubborn partisans of class interest will hold back, and racketeers will sabotage efforts to promote harmony. But if the forward-looking leaders of industry and labor will cooperate with the efforts of their Government to bring about industrial recovery and industrial peace, they will

render a great service to all who follow them and to the general welfare.

We have heard much lately about the need for certainty as to public policy and the need for assurances that would inspire confidence. Yet a veteran and impartial newspaperman remarked to me the other day that he had never known a President who had spoken as frankly and fully concerning the policies of his administration as has President Roosevelt.

It can be fairly said that today the chief disturbers of confidence, those who most impede our progress, are those who, out of the confusion of their own minds, or in order to serve selfish interests, continually raise false issues.

We have an administration of the Federal Government dedicated heart and soul to the preservation of our ancient liberties and to the maintenance of a political economic system of competitive individualism, civilized by a social conscience.

That administration is entitled to the support of the vast majority of American citizens who wish to see maintained in Washington a government faithful to American traditions and ideals, which will preserve for them the advantages and opportunities of living under constitutional safeguards of individual freedom.

The challenge of tomorrow is a challenge to the common sense and political judgment of the masses of the American people, not merely a challenge to their Government.

I believe the people and their Government will meet that challenge.

REMARKS BY MR. JUSTICE McREYNOLDS IN GOLD-CLAUSE CASES

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in the absence of the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Townsend], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the very interesting and illuminating remarks of Mr. Justice McReynolds in the recent gold-clause cases as printed in the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of Saturday, Feb. 23, 1935]

JUSTICE McREYNOLDS' REMARKS ON GOLD CASE DECISION

From the Wall Street Journal, Washington Bureau

WASHINGTON.—A more nearly complete version of Justice McReynolds' powerful remarks made in the Supreme Court prior to the rendering of the minority opinion in the gold-clause cases is presented herewith. No official stenographic report of the justice's observations was made. They have hitherto been reported only fragmentarily, and it was feared that they were lost to posterity. However, the Wall Street Journal is enabled to present the following which it believes to be substantially the text of what Justice McReynolds said:

"Mr. Justice Van Devanter, Mr. Justice Sutherland, Mr. Justice Butler, and I do not accept the conclusion which has been announced by the Court. To us the record reveals a clear purpose to bring about confiscation of private rights and the repudiation of national obligations. To us these things are powerful, and we cannot believe that the wise men who framed the Constitution intended that they should find shelter within it. But, on the contrary, they wrote there in words that ought not to be mistaken strictly their inhibitions against it.

"We have written down our views, they will be open for your observation. We assume that those of you who have interest enough in the matter to wish to comprehend it will find it possible to read it, therefore I shall not read it in extenso. It may be well, however, in order that you may hear now exactly what results from the conclusions which have been reached, that I should take a few minutes to rehearse to you just what this situation is, not minimizing it, not covering it in a thousand words, but in a plain, simple tale that you may understand without difficulty.

"It is impossible almost to overestimate the result of what has been done here this day. The Constitution as many of us have understood it, the Constitution that has meant so much to us, has gone. The guaranties which men and women heretofore have supposed protected them against arbitrary action have been swept away. The powers of Congress have been enlarged to such an extent no man can foresee their limitations, and we stand as a people today stripped of the very fundamental guaranties which we have heretofore supposed stood between us and arbitrary action.

"That statement is made to you with deliberation. It is not overdrawn and in the days to come perhaps as you see this panorama unfold you too will accept the truth.

THREE CLASSES OF CASES

"Now, let us inquire into this particular situation; there are three classes of cases which the court has decided; one class involves the case of private obligations, the other class embraces the solemn promise of the Government, the third class perhaps a still more solemn promise. In harmony with a policy which had been sanctioned by this Government for many, many years, these private individuals entered into contracts which they expected would protect them against a fluctuating currency, a depressed currency, if you will. Depressed currencies are nothing new. They had been known for 1,000 years, 2,000 years. Nero undertook to exercise the power when he was at Rome. Six centuries ago in France it was claimed as a prerogative of the sovereign. Now men who have entered into contracts which were perfectly legitimate have undertaken to protect themselves against it—the lender against a depreciated currency, the borrower against an appreciated cur-

rency. And so on the strength of these obligations hundreds of millions of dollars were loaned, and the great corporations of this country have been constructed, and your railroads, your canals, your buildings, almost all the great enterprises of this country have been built up on that. These bonds were sold to men and women and children throughout the world, and with them went the solemn promise that the takers would receive their money in the coin which they had furnished. Now Congress can sweep it away with a word and in face of the facts declare it is against public policy.

"Your Government bonds: Congress in 1900 enacted a solemn statute declaring that the basic money value should be the gold dollar, with 25.8 grains of gold. Congress later directed that in every Government bond there should be inserted a contract to pay in gold, and millions, billions of dollars were issued by this Government with that solemn contract in every one of them.

"During the World War men stood on the street corners and proclaimed the advantage of these bonds; they said 'We are offering you the finest investment the world has ever known, the solemn promise of the United States to pay you in gold dollars. Your country is in danger, your freedom is at stake, we need your assistance, and we beseech you to come and buy these things in order that we may prevail against the enemy', and billions of them were issued on that statement.

"Not only is that true, but on the 2d of May 1933, after the Government commandeered all of the gold of the United States, it issued and sold to the people of this United States five hundred million of these same bonds, with this same solemn promise.

GOLD CERTIFICATES ISSUED

"In 1900 the Government introduced the policy, which had been followed before, of receiving on deposit from citizens gold dollars and issuing to them certificates; the man took his money to the Treasury of the United States and deposited there in gold coin, and he received from that Treasurer a certificate acknowledging the receipt of it and promising to return it to him upon demand. Hundreds of millions of those certificates were outstanding, every one of them bearing the solemn assurance that upon demand the holder could get his gold.

"Now, what happened? That is the situation in April 1933; but under threat of heavy penalties they set out that every dollar of gold, all of the gold within the United States, should come into the Treasury, and directed that the Treasurer should issue for that any form of money that the Government chooses to pay. Millions, hundreds of millions came. We had gone off the gold standard, we had refused to recognize our obligations, or say that we could not. Our currency had depreciated, and for every dollar of bullion that we had received we issued a paper currency to the holder. But that was not enough. Notwithstanding on the 2d day of May, five hundred million of gold bonds had been sold to the public, on the 12th of May Congress passed a resolution in which it said it is our duty to raise the price of agricultural commodities and to lower the value of securities. It declared that every dollar issued by the United States, whatever form it took, should be equal to every dollar and gave the President the right to depreciate the gold content of the dollar 50 percent. Now, if the President, in that state of affairs, had reduced the dollar 50 percent, the holders of these gold securities, Government bonds, private bonds, gold certificates, would have been entitled, under the contract which they held, to be paid the value of the thing which they had contracted for in the currency of the country. That would not have served the purpose, apparently, and so it seemed to be necessary for Congress to pass an act in which it undertook, by direct action, to destroy every one of these contracts for the payment of gold, not only the private ones but its own contracts.

"Later the President did depreciate the dollar to about 60 cents. Then all the world was told that for these Government obligations, these private obligations, all other obligations, you must take 60 percent of what you contracted to receive.

NOT AGREEABLE SITUATION

"Now that is the state to which our Government has come, and that is the state of affairs out of which these suits arise. It is not an agreeable situation, it is not a thing which I like to talk about, and God knows I wish I did not have to; but there are some responsibilities which attach to a position upon this bench which men may not ignore, and it seems to be our duty to reveal to the bar, perhaps to the country, in all its nakedness, just what has been accomplished.

"Now a man with one of these private bonds demands payment. His debtor says, 'I have no gold with which to pay you, and I am prohibited by act of Congress from carrying out the contract which I made with you; here is a paper dollar you must take'; and you are at the end of your road. This Court has held that Congress may do that very thing.

"The holder of a Government bond, which promises to pay in gold, presents it, and the Treasurer says 'here is a paper dollar which you must take for your contract with the Government; we are prohibited from paying out any gold; and if you were paid in gold, you are prohibited from accepting it.' You insist, 'but my contract—you said that I would be paid in gold, or its equivalent.' The Treasurer of a great Nation replies, 'Take this paper dollar.' He comes to this Court, and this Court has held; in one breath it said that Congress has no power to repudiate Government obligations, that the Constitution gives it the right to contract itself and bind the Government for the payment of its bonds in any coin, in any way it chooses to do.

CONGRESS REPUDIATES DEBT

"In the next breath it says, it is not that; true it is, you have but 60 cents when you have a promise to pay a dollar, but Congress, without authority to repudiate its debts, has made it unlawful for you to accept what it is under obligation to pay, and since it is unlawful for you to accept what you contracted for, it follows that you are not damaged.

"This man doesn't go far on the strength of that reply in which he sees that logic. It seems to us that to reason like that is to give with one hand and take away with the other.

"Now, the gold certificates; a man comes in with a hundred thousand dollars of gold certificates, and they recite upon their face that there has been deposited in the Treasury of the United States 100,000 gold dollars, 'which we promise to pay upon presentation of this certificate.' He presents that certificate; what is he told? That we will give you 60 cents for each dollar, 'We offer you 60 cents, you must take it.' 'But', he says, 'you have in the Treasury of the United States my money, \$100,000 of it, which I placed with you upon the solemn promise to return it to me upon demand.' The Treasurer says: 'Congress has made it unlawful for us to pay out gold, it has made it unlawful for you to receive or to have gold in your possession', and the conclusion is that, therefore, you are not hurt. 'It is true we have paid you but \$60,000 of the kind of money which you left with me, but I have handed you a promise to pay something in the indefinite future and that is the full value now.' To us to reason like that, it seems not to reason at all. It is to state the conclusion without regard to the difficulties which one encounters in reasoning.

THE POWERS OF CONGRESS

"Now, we are told that all this is possible because under the provisions of the Constitution giving to Congress power to coin money and regulate its value, Congress may adopt a monetary system, and then it may put that monetary system into effect and sweep out of court everything that interferes with its consummation.

"In the discussion of this matter it is well to observe what the point at issue is, and not merely by covering up generalities with a multitude of words distract the mind from the point.

"No one denies the power of Congress to adopt the monetary system, but it does not follow that because Congress may adopt the monetary system that it may adopt any monetary system. When it adopts the system, it must adopt a reasonable and a proper one to carry out the purposes for which the power was given to it.

"What was that purpose? It was to fix standards, to permit Congress to provide a circulating medium to the public. It was not intended to enable Congress under the guise of law to repudiate. It was intended to give Congress the power to meet its honest obligations, and what was the effort in the *Legal Tender cases*. But here we have a monetary system—the intent, I almost said the wickedness, of which is almost beyond comprehension—what is it? This monetary system that supports the country.

"First, we will give to the President power to depreciate the dollar to 50 cents, afterward limited to 60 cents. Next, we will destroy all these private obligations by a statute entitled 'A Statute to Regulate the Currency of the United States.' And we not only destroy these private obligations, but we will destroy the Government's obligations as well, the same language, the same section that covers the one covers the other.

"And so having put out five hundred millions of gold-clause bonds in May, Congress in June says all of these promises to pay in gold are illegal and are contrary to public policy, the policy which has been strictly observed for many, many years, and has been approved by all courts where this exact question has been before them.

THE 60-CENT DOLLAR

"Having undertaken to destroy these gold clauses, the dollar is depreciated to 60 cents, and the prices of commodities will now be estimated in these deflated dollars and for all parties and all commodities instead of having a dollar we have 60 cents. All mortgages upon all railroads, all mortgages upon all buildings, all bank deposits, all insurance funds, everything that a thrifty man has accumulated for his old age is subjected to this depreciation, and we have the unholy question that I speak about.

"We, perhaps, are venturesome enough to say that no such power was ever granted by the framers of our Constitution. It was not there then. And it was not there yesterday; it is not there today. We are confronted with the vision of a dollar which may be reduced to 60 cents today, to 20 cents tomorrow, to 10 cents the next day, and to 1 cent the day following.

"That is the thing which we abhor, and we have tried to prevent its entrance into our legal system, but we have tried in vain. We are told that the Government has made out of these series of transactions the royal sum of \$2,800,000,000, and that that amount of gold now reposes in the Treasury, of gold dollars which may be used to pay public obligations, but 60-cent dollars against \$2,800,000,000. On the same basis, if you could depreciate the dollar to 10 cents and in the case of some to five-cent dollars, it will give you abundant capital to pay all the Government debts and discharge most of the private obligations which our citizens have contracted.

"We protest. That never was the law, it never ought to be the law, and the shame and humiliation of it all no one of us can foresee."

REPORT OF POLICY COMMITTEE OF NATIONAL PUBLIC HOUSING CONFERENCE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a very brief Report of the Policy Committee of the National Public Housing Conference.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROVAL BY THE WASHINGTON CONFERENCE OF THE REPORT ON SLUM CLEARANCE AND REHOUSING, JANUARY 20, 1935

The clear statement of purpose in the matter of slum clearance, included in the President's recent message to Congress, makes him the Nation's leader in this important field of social pioneering. To those assembled at the Second Washington Conference on Slum Clearance and Rehousing, the President's espousal of public housing, for the promotion of which this organization exists, is welcome indeed. His recognition of the great social evil of the slum gives us cause to hope that the program now directed toward its abolition may be continued and enlarged until the sought-for goal is attained. In a previous message to the National Housing Conference the President has stated that the beginnings made by the Housing Division of the Public Works Administration is slum clearance "may be regarded as no more than the first steps in a great and permanent campaign against those appalling slum conditions in which a third of our population is now forced to exist." To cope with a problem of such magnitude—involving, as it is estimated 5,000,000 families—this conference recommends that the following steps be taken with the greatest possible dispatch:

First, that the \$880,000,000 balance unexpended by the Public Works Administration and not otherwise allocated be made available immediately to the Housing Division to permit further construction of rehousing projects and for the imperatively necessary extension of the work of the Housing Division; also, that a major portion of the \$4,000,000,000 fund for public works be appropriated for public housing and that current Government activity in the field of public housing be expanded as rapidly as is compatible with efficiency. We recommend this action to accelerate the reemployment both of men and materials.

Second, that the program of the Housing Division be decentralized as rapidly as possible to allow an increasing latitude to local authorities which shall be subject only to conformity with standards and methods established by the Housing Division. We believe that this local responsibility, coupled with the weight of Presidential and congressional approval, will act as a spur to those cities still without power to initiate their own programs to secure such power from State legislative bodies.

Third, that Federal legislation be enacted to convert the Housing Division into a permanent and integral part of the Government structure. Recognizing the slum as a continuing problem, overshadowing the future and deeply rooted in the past, we appeal for extension of the Housing Division, so that (a) its work may no longer be limited by purposes of relief, recovery, or by other emergency factors; (b) its procedures may be more expeditious and more clearly defined; and (c) the present financial policy may be strengthened by providing loans at the same rate of interest the Government pays for its money, by the extension of the amortization period, and by a guaranty that the present subsidy of 30 percent of the cost of labor and materials will be continued.

POLITICAL SITUATION IN WASHINGTON—ARTICLE BY FRANK R. KENT

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I ask that an article by Frank R. Kent, published in the Baltimore Sun of February 25, 1935, relative to the political situation in Washington, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of Feb. 25, 1935]

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS
By Frank R. Kent

FACTS

WASHINGTON, February 25.

Perhaps Mr. Roosevelt, so often described as the "master politician of his time", by some shrewd, bold move may miraculously straighten out the situation that has developed in Washington.

It may be that he can center behind him a public sentiment that will send opposing Senators scurrying for cover. Or, by turning on the full strength of his "personal charm" he may persuade them to "be good." These have so consistently prevailed against the sober judgment of the country in the past 2 years that it is not yet safe to say they may not prove effective. However, it is no exaggeration to say that as things stand now they are in a mess.

For the sake of reality and to preserve a sense of proportion, it seems worth while to look the facts about Mr. Roosevelt in the face. There are signs now that some of them are beginning to sink in. For example, there are the basic facts that after 2 years Mr. Roosevelt has increased the national debt from twenty-two to thirty-three billions; that the accumulated deficit, two billion when he came in, is now nearer eleven; that 20,000,000 people are now living on relief; that there are more men out of work than a year ago; that the strain of the Federal relief and public-works

policies has brought most of the cities and States to the verge of bankruptcy.

Those are not controversial or partisan statements. They are admitted facts, too obvious to be argued. They are desperately real, but they would not be so appalling if the recovery schemes launched by Mr. Roosevelt were in healthy shape, with promise to pull us out eventually and justify their enormous cost. But they are not. No one contends they are. There is not one—literally not one—of the major experiments which is not sick—so sick that even the average voter could recognize the fact were his attention not diverted by the new and yet more dazzling scheme with which it is proposed to replace them.

Take a look at them—the A. A. A. seething with friction and split by factional strife, with its head, Mr. Wallace, obviously distressed and disheartened, forced to go in a direction he has publicly proclaimed as dangerous. After 2 years of A. A. A. the country for the first time is importing food instead of exporting; the cost of living has mounted for everybody; the farmer still cries for more; and the consumer is just beginning to feel the pinch. Take the N. R. A., a failure, so branded by its originators and sponsors, in a condition of incredible confusion, without a sense of direction, as unenforceable as the Volstead Act, and with neither public nor political support, the chief reason for its continuance being the 7,000 job holders who have established therein a vested interest.

The P. W. A. has been indicted by friends of the new deal as "worse than a failure", while Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hopkins alike have declared the Federal relief scheme under which we have been operating is no longer tolerable. The Federal Housing Commission, which was to revive the heavy industries and insure recovery, is in a state of inertia, despite the employment of 17 men in its "public relations" bureau, at a total salary of \$79,000, and 12 in its publicity section, with total salaries of \$45,900.

Only those who, for some reason, will not face the facts, or who, for some reason, are incapable of taking an unprejudiced view, will deny the above statements. They are true, and every clear-headed man in Washington knows them to be true. Actually, the 1935 program itself is the best evidence of their truth. In it Mr. Roosevelt proposes to continue N. R. A. and A. A. A., despite the condition of both, but to supersede the rest of the new deal by a vast new works-relief program involving \$5,000,000,000, and social-security legislation which will impose on the States various forms of old-age pensions, child pensions, and unemployment insurance—practically all of which are disguised relief plans which will put millions more on the Federal pay rolls.

Both are now hung up in Congress. Before the session began, there was scarcely anyone who did not believe Mr. Roosevelt would get anything he wanted at this session. So far he has gotten nothing. Beaten on the World Court, his works-relief bill has been changed so as to scuttle his plans, his social securities plans have aroused real antagonism, and his N. R. A. appeal is disregarded for an investigation. Somehow or other, Mr. Roosevelt must get through his works-relief bill, if he is to have any program this year. Without it, he is thrown back on measures he has already indicated as inadequate. Probably a way to save this bill will be found. Otherwise his program is in collapse.

There are those who think that that would be the best thing for the country, who ascribe the reverse he has sustained to an appreciation of the true condition of his experiments, to alarm over the mounting debt, to the fact that at last he has asked too much even for an anesthetized public, both as to power and as to money. In brief, as one Senator described it, "The people are beginning to realize that if we don't stop somewhere this man will pull us all over the brink."

ESTABLISHMENT OF RURAL FREE-DELIVERY SERVICE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a most interesting article from the Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News, written by W. W. Brewton, of Atlanta, Ga., concerning the authorship of the first measure providing for the free rural delivery of mails. The author of the article presents many facts to establish that the first legislation for this purpose ever adopted was sponsored by Hon. Thomas E. Watson, of Georgia, formerly a distinguished Member of this body, during the time he was serving in the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News, Feb. 20, 1935]

TOM WATSON AND RURAL FREE DELIVERY

Editor of the Daily News:

I address you this communication respecting the article on the American rural free delivery appearing in your issue for Sunday, January 13, 1935, the caption of which sets forth that Hon. John S. Henderson, of North Carolina, had been termed the father of this system.

The article gives prominent mention also of Thomas E. Watson and John Wanamaker. In view of the great step in human progress instituted by this innovation, I was very glad indeed to see your paper give space to its discussion. It was one of the greatest reforms this country has ever known. With respect to its origin, however, there is no doubt whatever. Many men had for years advocated the free delivery of mail in rural sections,

Thomas E. Watson among the number. Wanamaker, as Postmaster General, had promoted the star-route system, but he did not inaugurate rural free delivery for the simple reason that it required a law to do so. As you, of course, know, the star-route system was the free delivery of mail to small towns and villages off the railroads. That was not rural free delivery, as the author of your article recognizes, nor was it recognized as such by the law, or by Mr. Henderson, of North Carolina, who, as Chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads for the House in 1893, was in charge of the post-office appropriation bill for that year.

The American rural free delivery was created by law. There was no other way to create it. It began, consequently, with the first law providing for it. That first law was naturally the first law that appropriated money for it, as there could have been no such thing as creating the system without money. The very first law ever enacted in the history of the United States for rural free delivery of mail was on February 17, 1893. On that date the House of Representatives of the United States Congress passed an amendment, introduced by Thomas E. Watson, providing that the sum of \$10,000 be taken from the money appropriated for the Post Office Department and used by the Postmaster General in starting rural free delivery of mail; that is to say, free delivery to rural inhabitants, those not living in cities, towns, or villages, but separately in the country to themselves. If you will have recourse to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the date named above, you will see that Mr. Henderson made it very clear (he knowing the full history of mail delivery by virtue of being in charge of the bill for the Department to be passed) that if the House adopted Mr. Watson's amendment it would be the first time money had been appropriated for rural delivery, delivery outside cities, towns, and villages. On the date named, the House, sitting as a Committee of the Whole House, agreed to the Watson amendment, which incorporated it in the bill.

Now the post-office bill itself, the measure carrying all the money for post offices and post roads for the year, was passed on March 3, 1893. The Watson amendment thus became law on that date. The amendment was adopted on February 17, which merely incorporated it in the bill; but when the bill with all its amendments was passed on March 3, then the measure for rural free delivery became law, the President's signature, of course, following in due course as the record of laws passed shows. So February 17, 1893, is the date of the birth of the American rural free delivery. The advocacy of rural free delivery by Watson, Henderson, Wanamaker, or anyone else prior to that time did not inaugurate it. It was inaugurated by the first law for it. That law was passed, was secured by Thomas E. Watson. The Second Assistant Postmaster General says, in a circular now being mailed out, that Wanamaker was the first official to suggest rural delivery. Suggest, of course, was all the Postmaster General could do. He was a pioneer for it, but so with Watson and many others. This circular says also that James O'Donnell, of Michigan, introduced the first measure for rural delivery on January 5, 1892, but that it did not pass. Of course the record shows it did not pass. That year Watson and Lon Livingstone, both of Georgia, introduced measures for rural free delivery and both failed to pass. There were repeated failures. The first success was on February 17, 1893, when the House in Committee of the Whole agreed to the Watson amendment.

According to the Second Assistant Postmaster General, in said circular, the second appropriation for rural delivery was \$20,000, on July 16, 1894; and the third, on June 9, 1896, for \$10,000. It further says that the system was inaugurated in West Virginia on October 1, 1896; that the 1893 appropriation and 1894 appropriation were not used until after the 1896 appropriation, on the ground that the first two did not make enough money, in the opinion of the Postmaster General, to properly launch the system. Nevertheless, as the circular points out, the Postmaster General began with \$40,000, which means, of course, that he began with the Watson appropriation of \$10,000, the next one of \$20,000, and the third one of \$10,000. But that was simply the way the Postmaster General did it. The law said for him to start it with the 1893 appropriation Watson secured. The bill then made it mandatory for him to start experimenting with Rural Free Delivery on \$10,000. That was the law. The fact that he did not start until 1896, despite the law, did not change the law. My point is that the mere fact that he did not start until he had \$30,000 to add to Watson's \$10,000 does not prevent the Watson appropriation from being the beginning of the system. It was the first money appropriated, was the first law creating the system, and was in the pot with the first money ever used. If by "Father of Rural Free Delivery" is meant the man who secured the first law (and manifestly nobody else could have been the actual creator, though many were advocates of it), the record is absolutely plain, unequivocal, and final that Thomas E. Watson is that man.

WILLIAM W. BREWTON.

ATLANTA, GA.

AN AMERICAN FIRESIDE—RADIO BROADCAST BY SENATOR WHEELER AND OTHERS

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radiobroadcast by Norman Hapgood, Roy Thurman, and myself, delivered on the 3d instant, on the subject of An American Fireside.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN AMERICAN FIRESIDE

OPENING ANNOUNCEMENT

An American Fireside! Tonight our fireside host, Norman Hapgood, has invited as his guest Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, the distinguished United States Senator from Montana and Chairman of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee.

Mr. Hapgood has just greeted Senator WHEELER and they are seated at the fireside with Roy Thurman, of the National Home Library Foundation. Mr. Hapgood is speaking:

Mr. HAPGOOD. Senator WHEELER, we are especially glad to have you with us this evening because in past weeks we have devoted a number of our fireside hours to a discussion of democracy and those principles which make for a country that is free and progressive.

Mr. THURMAN. Senator, I imagine you and Mr. Hapgood are accustomed to having some pretty hot discussions together.

Senator WHEELER. Yes. We started arguing as soon as we met, in Berlin, some 13 years ago, and we have been at it, off and on, ever since.

Mr. HAPGOOD. The Senator was headed for Russia, Thurman, when we met in Germany, with the same energy that has marked everything he has ever done; and the same fearlessness. Things have changed in those two countries, Burt.

Senator WHEELER. Yes; they have their tremendous problems, just as we have ours.

Mr. THURMAN. You must have been pretty close, Mr. Hapgood, to some of the Senator's activities right here in Washington, also.

Senator WHEELER. Norman and I have been in at least two fights on the same side; and lively fights at that.

Mr. HAPGOOD. Yes; you know, of course, that Senator WHEELER was a candidate for Vice President on the ticket with the elder La Follette in 1924; and I ardently supported that ticket. The other fight to which the Senator refers was the great oil scandals, in which he did superb work. At one time we formed a committee, of which I was chairman, to arouse public opinion against the persecution to which Wheeler was subjected by the Department of Justice.

Mr. THURMAN. Those must have been lively days for both of you. You speak of arousing public opinion. How did the newspapers behave, Senator? Did they help educate the people to what was behind Fall and Daugherty?

Senator WHEELER. Did they? Not they. At one time Senator Tom Walsh and I were treated by most of the respectable newspapers as if we were public enemies no. 1 and no. 2. Cleaning up a situation where big interests are involved is not usually popular at the beginning.

Mr. HAPGOOD. But now it is recognized that the Senate has no function more useful than the function of investigation. You are now chairman of the important Committee on Interstate Commerce, Burt, and I should like very much to hear you on the Senate as an institution. Don't leave out the sensitive point that it is charged with filibustering too much.

Senator WHEELER. That charge has, of course, been repeated many times. The Senate, however, is really an institution greater than any of its Members, and I might almost say greater than the sum of all its Members.

Mr. THURMAN. What exactly do you mean, Senator? I should think that most institutions are greater than their individual members.

Senator WHEELER. Yes; but the Senate is the only legislative body of its kind in the world. Never are more than one-third of its number newly elected. Two-thirds of its total number remain a body of some continuity. It has had an uninterrupted existence since 1789, almost 150 years.

Mr. THURMAN. There is a quotation in an article in Fortune magazine this month which says of the Senate that it is the greatest deliberative body in the world and preserves a power which neither the senate of Rome nor the senate of the Venetians enjoyed.

Senator WHEELER. That's very true. It not only passes laws and confirms appointments and ratifies treaties, but above all, as Hapgood has just hinted, it is the only body that acts as complainant, prosecutor, judge, and jury. It has the power to indict, to impeach, and, above all, to investigate.

Mr. HAPGOOD. The Senate's power to investigate is, in my opinion, highly beneficial to popular government. It serves notice to those in high places in Government that their acts are reviewable, and it has also enabled the public time after time to uncover gross violations and even crimes on the part of men in positions of business or political power.

Senator WHEELER. Right you are, Norman. Take away the power of investigation from the Senate, and you deprive the people of a valuable instrument which has in the past, as now in the present, been responsible for legislation remedying abuses and ills in the body politic as well as preventing the recurrence of further injustices.

Mr. THURMAN. What outstanding investigations would you name, Senator, which through the publicity given them, educated the public and produced a popular demand for beneficial legislation.

Senator WHEELER. There have been too many to mention, but the outstanding investigations of the past that come to mind are the Pujo, the Teapot Dome, the Daugherty, and the banking and currency investigations.

Mr. HAPGOOD. I am glad you included the Pujo investigation. That inquiry was one of the first great steps toward making the country understand that the old trustee conception of banking

was dying and that great bankers were becoming mixed up in the kind of business that is a frenzied chase after quick wealth. What you have been doing more recently is part of the same movement.

Senator WHEELER. The banking and currency investigation will go down as one of the most beneficial chapters of public service ever performed in the Senate's whole history. Its exposure of how the bankers use other people's money; how they fleeced depositors and investors, ruined industries, and contributed in no small measure to the panic of 1929, led Congress to enact legislation that everybody agrees is of the highest value to the financial health of the Nation.

Mr. HAPGOOD. I am speaking for myself right now, Burt, and not for you or anybody else, when I say that what your investigations have uncovered go much further than individual shortcomings; further even than the fault of a whole group of powerful men to live up to their traditional responsibilities. They lead to the great question of how much size—which means how much power—can safely pass over to a few big corporations.

Senator WHEELER. I was just about coming to that point.

Mr. HAPGOOD. Raymond Moley, in his weekly magazine, *Today*, has coined a pretty expression for this concentration of power. I am going to ask Professor Moley to talk about this subject next Sunday at this fireside. This concentration of power, Moley calls private socialism, and he goes on to say that all the arguments made by big business against state socialism can be turned into arguments against the same vast concentration of power in private hands.

Senator WHEELER. I noticed Moley's issue of February 2 and hope he will keep hammering along that line.

Mr. HAPGOOD. I suppose most of us are disappointed in what regulation has done to check abuses in big business. The difficulty is that regulation must depend on the people in power. When you realize that two Presidents have endeavored to get Eastman off the Interstate Commerce Commission because they thought him too radical, we see how easily the clock may be set back.

Senator WHEELER. However, they failed to get him off.

Mr. HAPGOOD. Yes; but only through the intervention of a powerful individual from Massachusetts, both times.

Mr. THURMAN. Who was the individual, and who were the two Presidents?

Mr. HAPGOOD. Oh, come now, Roy, that is indiscreet. I will tell you secretly. I will say now only that one of the Presidents ought to have known better, and one of them did not know much of anything. However, to get back on the track, if regulation is so insecure a weapon, Burt, how about the taxing power as a sure-fire method of controlling this private socialism?

Senator WHEELER. More discussion ought to be given to the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, in which the Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Cardozo, upholds the right to tax for the purpose of controlling size.

Mr. THURMAN. That case bears on the taxation of chain stores, does it not, Senator?

Senator WHEELER. It does; but there is nothing to prevent the application of the same principle over a wider field.

Mr. HAPGOOD. In fact, if my sources of information are correct, something along that line will happen this very week.

Senator WHEELER. So you know my bill to tax size is to be introduced in a day or two?

Mr. HAPGOOD. I do; and I look upon the step as a landmark in history. I wish you would explain to Thurman here, who is a good young progressive, just what is in the bill.

Senator WHEELER. With the proper safeguards and exceptions it puts a tax, sharply rising with size, on gross assets of corporations. For example, if the assets are over \$1,000,000 and under \$5,000,000, the tax is \$1 per thousand; then up to \$10,000,000 it is \$2; and so on up to a size between \$200,000,000 and \$300,000,000, when it is \$10. In the last case, you see, at \$10 per thousand, 1 percent of the capital would be taken away in a year.

Mr. HAPGOOD. Another method would be to tax the turnover, instead of the volume of assets. However, I think your plan is better. In the future there will be valuable debating on that and other points, but the main point is that we are now started.

Senator WHEELER. Yes; that is the point, and the purpose is made clearer in the last section, which reads thus:

"Sec. 6. The Federal Trade Commission is authorized and directed to make a study and investigation of the relation, in the various types of business enterprises, of the total resources of a corporation to its efficiency, with a view to determining differences in the desirable maximum size of corporations according to differences in classes of business. The Federal Trade Commission shall report to the Congress on or before January 1, 1937, the results of its investigation and study, together with its recommendations."

Mr. HAPGOOD. Gee, that is hot material, Burt. It puts you once more right out in the vanguard of progress. And no matter what else is decided to be a necessary part of a new deal, or, on the contrary, a mere experiment to be dropped, this wrestling with the Basic Curse of Bigness (to take the title of the latest book collecting the views of Justice Brandeis) must be kept up.

Senator WHEELER. I do not pretend to know how much support the move will have.

Mr. HAPGOOD. If you have in mind the President—

Senator WHEELER. I did not say so.

Mr. HAPGOOD. I know you didn't. The responsibility is mine. I am sure the President is 100 percent behind this principle. What he may be able to do at any moment depends largely on what else is put up to him. If the 57 varieties of wild infla-

tionists get really busy, his whole strength may have to be given to cracking nuts; but if the liberal elements in Congress, and the sensible radicals—I mean those who are radical in purpose but rational in method and timing—if those elements keep the loose and inexperienced theorists from using up all his strength, I am confident he will have his heart in this purpose of yours. Anybody of sense, whether in his political circle or not, knows he, like Wilson before him, wishes to bring about great democratic changes by expert methods. One of my mottoes is that hell is paved with good intentions.

Senator WHEELER. All right, Norman, that is your speech. If you have finished, I will go on telling why it is necessary, for the sake of freedom, to follow up this war on bigness. We are all familiar with the argument that bigness brings about economy and efficiency. This is true only up to a certain point in size, differing in different businesses, which is one reason for section 6 of my bill, calling for an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission. On the basis of that report we ought to be able to adjust size in various lines to social aims. The most general truth about very big combinations is that after controlling a market they proceed to kill off the little fellow, and after they have done that they go on to all kinds of devices, such as extra stock dividends and holding companies, to make the public pay enough to give a profit on a mass of securities that represent no money invested but merely a trick to cover up excessive profit. One other thing should never be left anywhere except in the foreground of discussion, and that is the control of opinion—in newspapers, in schools, in colleges—that the swollen business units set out to secure. We have a good way of testing what I have said about the inefficiency of big units. When we begin to tax size, the very efficient big units can pay the tax; the inefficient ones will not and will have to break into smaller ones.

Mr. HAPGOOD. Some of the more efficient ones may see the writing on the wall and act before they have to. For instance, I notice that one of the most successful grocery chains is cutting down the number of stores it owns right now, with an explanation of the advantages of independent smaller units. Now I don't want to spring too many big news stories in one talk, but I notice this: One of the reservations in your bill for taxing size applies to business already under regulation, like the railroads. Of course, the railroad has been a great issue, especially in your part of the country, for about 60 years.

Senator WHEELER. I have been preparing a bill for Government ownership of all the railroads in the country. When I first came to the Senate I thought that a solution to the perplexing railroad situation was Government ownership. I have learned that Government ownership does not necessarily improve matters, but after an intensive study of the pros and cons, I am convinced today that the Government ownership of railroads is the only way out of the perplexing difficulties facing private ownership and management of this most important of public utilities.

Mr. THURMAN. Senator, I can appreciate your cogent arguments for Government ownership and operation of railroads. But wouldn't unification of the railroads with the attendant elimination of duplication that you mentioned as an evil imply the dismissal of thousands of railroad employees—thus adding to our unemployment problems?

Senator WHEELER. Possibly, but only temporarily, if at all. If we unified the roads and improved and modernized the service and cut out the huge waste, the result of a debt-ridden carrier system, the railroads of the country would be used more, rates could be lowered, traffic would tend to increase, and steady employment be assured. The situation now facing both skilled and unskilled railroad workers is awful in instability and insecurity alone. Let me not neglect to add that the return of a normal or increased traffic, which would inevitably follow the governmental operation, would provide a needed stimulus to the Nation's basic industries.

Mr. HAPGOOD. No doubt you have read Coordinator Eastman's latest report?

Senator WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. HAPGOOD. It is long, but some general views stand out. He thinks it is absurd to manage railroads separately from other methods of transportation, such as water, busses, and air. Short of that big unification he favors consolidation of the railroads themselves.

Senator WHEELER. I agree, of course, with much, or most, of what Mr. Eastman says. As to the busses, I do not wish them handicapped, merely to help the railroads, and I do not believe he does. They represent progress, and the public should have the benefit of that progress. Another point is that I do not think the reforms suggested by Eastman, such as the needed amount of unification, will ever be carried out under private ownership, because the vested interests, in the railroad officials themselves, and in the financial manipulators, will be strong enough to prevent the reforms.

Mr. HAPGOOD. Many people suspect that Eastman agrees with you. And I am glad you put weight on the other evil we may run into; the evil of putting more and more power into the hands of whatever groups of men happen to be running the Government at the moment. Every time you turn over to the Government a new function you put into its hands a new weapon of influence, or coercion, through the use of what we politely call patronage, and Grover Cleveland might have called plunder. Of course, just now, with people uncomfortable, and mortgaging the future, through the National Government's going into debt, there

is more desire to dump everything on the central Government, than there will be when we begin to feel the taxes.

Senator WHEELER. I appreciate all that. The law, or the system, is often less important than the administration of the law or the system.

Mr. HAPGOOD. Exactly, as Pope has it:

"For forms of law let fools contest.
Whate'er is best administered is best."

Senator WHEELER. That does express the principle, and, of course, a poet has the right to exaggerate. It is true that when we turn the railroads, or any other big utility, over to the Government we are up against the question of administration without a sufficiently expert and independent civil-service system.

Mr. HAPGOOD. Of Government ownership, Eastman says it offers the greatest advantages, and also the greatest dangers. He believes so great a change ought not to be taken without submission to the public, and many of us do not believe the public yet favors it.

Senator WHEELER. I agree that it should first meet with definite public expression of approval. Also I agree that today the public would not approve; I think it will approve as soon as it fully understands what has been done to the railroads by the manipulators. For example, since the panic of 1929 it has been necessary for the Federal Government to lend huge sums of money to the railroads in order that they might continue to pay interest on their bonds and to maintain their service. It is my belief that much of these huge sums will never be recovered by the Government. I further believe that the present plight of the railroads has not been caused so much by mismanagement of executives and managers as by the manipulation of railroad funds and securities owned by bankers and stock promoters. I believe also that if private ownership of railroads is allowed to continue many roads will collapse and bring down with them insurance companies and other institutions which have heavy investments in them.

Mr. HAPGOOD. Certainly the attitude of the public will be determined by how fully it is informed. When the whole story is understood the control of opinion by big units will be more easily seen and stopped. Since the railroads have been regulated their control of opinion has been lessened. They are not today in the same category as other utilities that do control or attempt to control public opinion.

Senator WHEELER. That is true. Take the approaching fight over holding companies. That is imminent. And how simple it is, when you come down to it. In the whole fight against size there is nothing so simple. Because—and note this—to tax holding companies, what do you do? You do nothing whatever except take away an exemption. That ought to be pounded in, over and over, in reply to any propaganda that goes out on the other side.

Mr. HAPGOOD. The big propaganda will be what it always is—the innocent purchasers, widows and orphans. I must look it up, because I am trusting my memory, but I am pretty sure that once, while he was at Albany, Al Smith made a statement to the effect that you cannot have progress without casualties. I may add on my own account that they are usually casualties of past evils. What bothers me more is what you said a minute ago about government at Washington and our lack of preparation. That, fortunately, does not apply to taxation of size, but it does apply to a large part of the reforms that lie ahead of us.

Senator WHEELER. As a Nation we can progress only insofar as we develop an enlightened and informed citizenry. On my last trip to England I found that the average London policeman knew more about public affairs and government and the international situation than the average business man or lawyer in America. You know, Norman, while I am sometimes accused of blaming all of our economic ills upon the rich, that is not correct. I have repeatedly told the people of my State that they get, and the people of this Nation get, exactly the kind of government they deserve—no better and no worse. We are all very apt to blame the rich and those in high places for all the ills which the human flesh is heir to, as well as all of our economic ills, for the drought in Montana and for the halitosis among the Negroes in the South. But that isn't fair. Every man and woman in the United States has some responsibility for the economic condition, for the panic of 1929, and for the conditions in which we find ourselves today. I do blame the rich and powerful and those in high places, however, because they were in a position where they should have led, and they did not do so. Instead, they unloaded upon the people of this country the watered stocks and bonds. They urged and encouraged the gambling, and the big bankers unloaded upon the little bankers their European and their South American worthless bonds. If this country is to be saved from the fate of every other civilization, they must use the intelligence which the good Lord has endowed them with.

Mr. HAPGOOD. We need that lesson, and a lot of my virtuous friends were trading on margins in 1929. But what about that policeman in London who knew so much?

Senator WHEELER. England, as a country, of course, has always depended for its very life on foreign trade, and this fact has led to the necessity, felt by all her citizens, of intensively studying public questions. People understand what they have to understand. Our people, it is hardly necessary to say, are not less intelligent than the British. The point is, they have had a virgin continent to develop, and have given their thought to the marvelous possibilities of that development. When it is necessary to understand a question they will understand it.

Mr. HAPGOOD. Good! That is the sound democratic faith. Every week, at this fireside, we try not to stop before we have told

the listeners, the thousands who are coming to look to us for guidance, how they can go along preparing themselves for grappling with the future. Have you learned most of your lessons from life—experience, Burt, like Al Smith, or have you been a good deal of a reader?

Senator WHEELER. It has been mostly experience with me, Norman, and thinking about experience; and, of course, reading what goes with law, a vast field, and whatever I could get to help me in the fields of finance, economics, and industry. But you know, old man, I have six children, and, of course, with their varied tastes, other lines of books are buzzing about in the family.

Mr. HAPGOOD. Sure enough, my children are giving me a lot of education, too. We must get after that subject some time. For my part, I am a violent enthusiast on the rising generation. Thanks for your help, Burt. And the best of luck to you in the crusades ahead of you. The banner of freedom, as Byron said, is torn and bleeding, but streaming ever against the wind. You don't mind that. Thanks again.

INTEREST-BEARING DEBTS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I present a radio address delivered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] over a national broadcasting network on Saturday afternoon, February 16, which I ask may be published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am going to talk to you today, not about the price of wheat or corn or cotton or the allotment plan, but about a matter which vitally affects every American, and particularly the farmer. The fundamental sore spot in this depression is the burden of debt which is crushing down all our efforts to increase the national wealth and the flow of commerce. As long as there is a charge of from 5 to 10 percent interest on every issuance of credit, we can no more stabilize prosperous times than we can raise ourselves by our bootstraps.

One of the causes of this burden of debt and interest is over-capitalization of our big industries. How does this affect the farmer? Let me show you. We will say that there are 10 shoe factories, each one of which has been built from scratch by one man over a period of a number of years. Each one has a reputation for workmanship and quality and has an established market, each making money. Along comes Mr. Promoter. He sees 10 fairly prosperous small shoe factories, and an idea is born. If the 10 factories can make money separately, think of the profits that could be gouged if they could be combined into one. The idea soon becomes a corporation. The 10 factories are bought up for a million dollars by the promoter with the bankers' money and are sold to the new corporation for \$2,000,000. The added million dollars is explained as being the value of one combined management for the 10 factories, and it goes to the promoter and the banker for the idea. Thus the new merger has to earn profits on \$2,000,000 when, as a matter of fact, it is only worth one million. It has to have a president at \$50,000 or more a year, and about six vice presidents at \$10,000 a year. The men who pay for it all are the producers of raw materials and the consumer. He has to give enough for his shoes to pay interest and dividends on stock which is half water. When the corporation starts to go broke it issues gilt-edged double A bonds or sells new issues of stocks calling for still further interest burdens on the consumer. It will keep on issuing stocks and bonds until it cannot find another widow or orphan to buy them. It is the story of the power companies and all the holding companies. There are countless receivership records and bankruptcy cases which will bear me out. Of the 35 most notable mergers effected before 1903, 23 of them failed to make as much for the 10 years after merger as did their constituent companies before the merger. The main reason was the incurrence of heavier interest and dividend burdens through watered stock.

In order to maintain their rotted financial structures they must cut labor's share to the bone; they must depress the market for their raw materials, which the farmer produces, and take everything from the consumer that the traffic will bear. You farmers get it both ways. You sell the raw materials and are also one of the biggest consumers. But the interest burden strikes the farmer even more directly than this. The farm is decidedly a business enterprise. It takes capital to run a farm. Up to the last few years farmers have had to pay from 8 to 12 and more percent for the capital necessary to carry on their business. This administration has gone a long way toward reducing interest rates on farm credit. But they are still too high. Farmers in my State have come to me with their problems. Some of them have borrowed \$5,000, 10 years ago. Over that 10-year period they have paid out in interest at 10 percent, \$5,000. They still owe \$5,000 on the debt. Ten years of diligent and honest, hard work and the debt remains the same. I know that there are thousands of farmers in the West who have gone through just this experience. It is treadmill. After years of uphill pull they find themselves in the same place.

We would have no problem of underconsumption, so-called "over-production", unemployment, and bread lines if this crushing debt structure could be removed. Stocks and bonds are debts in the same sense that mortgages are. The United States Government has been the worst offender in continuing the interest burden on the American public. At the present time they have borrowed nearly \$30,000,000,000 and are paying interest on it. Interest on this sum is paid at the rate of \$900,000,000 a year, or \$7 apiece for every man, woman, and child in the United States. In other words, the money lenders are allowed to tax the people of the United

States in this amount because they issue money for the Government. Yet the Constitution of the United States expressly guards the people against this very thing when it provides that the Congress shall issue money and regulate the value thereof. In the face of this express provision we see the Government borrowing money which the bankers have created out of nothing, and paying the bankers dividends in the form of interest besides. The bankers lend money to the Government, and our so-called "financial leaders" beam with approval. But when there is a whisper of protest and a suggestion that the Government exercise its power in the Constitution and issue its own money, there is a flood of propaganda and long, loud walls of "baloney" dollars, fiat money, greenbacks, printing-press money, and other catchwords.

But wait, where did this thirty billion lent to the Government come from? Was it cash? Certainly not, there is nowhere near that amount of cash in circulation today. There are only between five and six billion dollars of actual currency in circulation. Of that amount a billion dollars is carried around in the pockets of the people. The bankers cannot lend this to the Government. A billion of it is in the cash registers and tills of merchants. The bankers cannot lend this to the Government. A billion of it is in the banks, but must be used in over-the-counter transactions, and cannot be lent out. This leaves only between two and three billions in circulation. Where, then, did all this banker money come from to finance 30 billions of Government bond issues? It is credit money, and can be inflated and blown up like a balloon. It is the kind of money the bankers claimed for deposits in 1929, nearly 60 billions of it, created out of watered stocks and bonds and false values. There is your "baloney" dollar, your fiat money, and this is what the people pay \$7 a head for every year in interest. Sixty billions of credit inflation, the greatest inflation this country had ever known. This was cheap money. The other day the House of Representatives passed a measure calling for expenditure of \$4,880,000,000 for the coming year for public works. If the bill passes the Senate and is signed by the President, the money will be raised by selling bonds. It will cost the people of the United States over a hundred million dollars a year to use this banker-made money. I have introduced an amendment to this bill which will provide for the issuance of non-interest-bearing United States notes instead of bonds, with provision for retiring them from circulation at the rate of 4 percent a year. If this amendment is adopted, it will save the people a hundred million dollars annually and will be no more fiat money than that which we would get from the bankers. There would be the same thing back of both the bonds and the notes—that is, the credit of the Government. This amendment has been rejected by the Senate committee studying the bill, but I am going to carry the fight to the floor of the Senate in the belief that if we can win it will be a step in the right direction for the consumers and the producers of raw materials of this Nation. We could issue this amount and still retain the ratio between gold and currency as we have nine billions of metallic reserves in the Treasury. I have been called an inflationist and a dangerous radical. By this amendment I would increase the amount of money in circulation by \$4,000,000,000, yet when the Chase National Bank and the National City Bank foist on the public a hundred million dollars in worthless stocks and bonds they are inflating the circulating medium in just the same way. There are only two differences. When the Government issues the money, the credit of the United States is behind it, rather than some unsound promoters' scheme. Secondly, when there is this inflation by the Government, the benefit of it is given into the hands of the people who need it most in the form of relief, and immediately becomes purchasing power. When the banks inflate credit, the profit never steps down into the hands of the people, but rather goes to swell incomes in the higher brackets.

The alarmists will point to Germany's mark, Russia's ruble, the French franc, but there is no parallel. The bankers could throw us into the same situation that faced these Governments if this Government did not issue another dollar. The bankers inflated their credit from nothing to ten billion, to twenty, then on to fifty, and to nearly sixty billion dollars in 1929—then when deflation was the order of the day this ephemeral bankers' counterfeit money dropped by ten millions, then twenty, then finally down to \$28,000,000,000. I say to you that no one group of private citizens, motivated solely by a desire for profits, should be able to so completely control the destinies of a hundred and twenty million American sovereigns. There is only one possible cure for it, and that is for the Government to control its own credit and place it in the hands of the people in the form of purchasing power. If that policy is not embarked upon now voluntarily, it will be forced upon us later, and the process of forcing it upon us is liable to be attended by many hardships and much suffering. A few days ago an issue was raised in the United States Senate which bore upon this problem. I introduced an amendment to the Farm Loan Act calling for a reduction in the interest rate on loans through the Farm Credit Administration from $4\frac{1}{2}$ percent to $3\frac{1}{2}$ percent. There was strong opposition to the amendment, and the debate lasted several days. We were finally able to pass the amendment by a vote of 43 to 39, and I am in hopes that it will be adopted in the House of Representatives and signed by the President. If it is, it will mean a saving on an average of \$63 a year to 395,000 farm families who have borrowed from the Farm Credit Administration.

This is just a start. Figures have been published showing that at the present time there are outstanding \$281,000,000,000 of long-term, interest-bearing debt in this country. The interest on this

staggering sum—interest which must be paid—amounts to more than double the income of all the farmers. This is the rent we pay the money lenders, and it is a rent which we must abolish if we are ever to build a permanent prosperity.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be given leave to submit reports during the recess or adjournment of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I may not have any objection, but I do not understand the purport of the request.

Mr. ROBINSON. I shall make a further statement in explanation of the request.

There is practically no business on the Calendar of the Senate, as the Senator from Oregon understands. Just a day or two ago we proceeded with the calendar, both for the consideration of unobjected bills and for the consideration of bills under rule VIII. It is probable that at the conclusion of today's business I shall ask that the Senate adjourn or recess until next Monday, in order that the committees of the Senate, practically all of which are very busy, may have an opportunity to carry on their labors.

I am informed that the Committee on Appropriations probably will report a general appropriation bill tomorrow. I did not deem it necessary to have a session of the Senate for that purpose, and thought that by the arrangement which has been asked the committee could submit its report during the recess or adjournment of the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is the proposal now made by the Senator limited to appropriation bills?

Mr. ROBINSON. It was not so limited; no.

Mr. McNARY. What I had particularly in mind was that, as everyone realizes, in a way this proposal abrogates a standing rule of the Senate; namely, that when the report of a committee is made it must lie over until the succeeding day.

I have no objection to the proposed agreement if it appertains to appropriation bills only, but assuming that the relief joint resolution should come in under the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, on the very day we reconvene, whether it be on Friday or Saturday or Monday, that measure would come up automatically, whereas I should want it to lie over in order that Senators might have an opportunity to read the hearings and discuss the problem fully among themselves and with those who are interested in the matter.

Mr. ROBINSON. I may say to the Senator that I have no information that the Committee on Appropriations will be ready to report the work-relief joint resolution prior to the end of the present week. If it should do so, however, and the joint resolution should be reached by the Senate for consideration, I should not insist upon taking it up on the first day of next week. I should be very glad to concede that the joint resolution should go over at least for a day if the Senator from Oregon or any other Senator should request that such course be taken.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I understand that the request of the Senator from Arkansas has reference to the War Department appropriation bill.

Mr. McNARY. That was the question I was asking.

Mr. ROBINSON. I had in mind a general appropriation bill.

Mr. McNARY. I think the matter can be simplified by having the agreement apply only to general supply bills. I desire to see expedition employed in the disposal of the relief measure, but I still insist that we should have an opportunity to consider it before we are forced to its discussion or to a vote upon it. So if the Senator will modify his request, and limit it to supply bills, I shall have no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have leave to report, during the recess or adjournment of the Senate, any general appropriation bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Would it accomplish the Senator's purpose if he should confine his unanimous-consent request to the particular recess to be taken today, rather than making it a general rule for the whole session?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. That is what I understood.

Mr. ROBINSON. That was my intention.

Mr. McNARY. I understood that it applied only to the particular week-end recess which I understand is to be taken today.

Mr. ROBINSON. That is my understanding.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request for unanimous-consent agreement submitted by the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The morning business is closed.

ADMINISTRATION OF CODES UNDER THE N. R. A.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. A few moments ago the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] desisted, at the request of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], from making a statement concerning an amendment proposed by him. The Chair feels, therefore, that he should recognize the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. REYNOLDS obtained the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understand that the resolution which the Senator from Mississippi has in mind relates to the proposed investigation of the N. R. A.

Mr. HARRISON. I may say to the Senator that it is my intention to ask the Senator from North Carolina if he will yield to me so that I may make a motion on that subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been suggested that if the Senator from North Carolina is willing to permit the resolution to which the Senator from Mississippi refers to be brought before the Senate in a formal way, the Senator from North Carolina may then address the Senate on whatever subject he desires.

Mr. HARRISON. I inquire of the Senator if it would be agreeable to him to permit a motion for that purpose to be made, and then proceed with his speech.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 79.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, Senate Resolution 79, submitted by Mr. NYE and Mr. McCARRAN on the 14th instant, for an investigation of certain charges concerning the administration of industrial codes by the National Recovery Administration, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance and the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with amendments.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I desire to ask for the adoption of an amendment unanimously recommended by the Finance Committee. On page 5, lines 6 and 7, I move that the words "or any subcommittee thereof" be stricken from the resolution, so that the whole Committee on Finance will make the investigation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the amendment? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I inquire of the Senator what is intended to be done concerning the suggestion which was made in the committee of the possibility of combining the resolution which is now pending and the one offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]?

Mr. HARRISON. Under the parliamentary status, the only way in which that could be done would be by an amendment which might be offered embodying the two propositions, which I did not intend to propose. I was anxious to get this part of the resolution out of the way.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from North Carolina, I should like to say that it seems to me a very unusual procedure for the Senate to authorize two investigations into the same subject, to be conducted simultaneously—

Mr. ROBINSON. By different committees.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. By different committees, and that it will inevitably lead to confusion. I should like to suggest that the same objectives may be achieved by simply authorizing or directing the Finance Committee to inquire into the same subject matter which is covered by the resolution of the Senator from Utah.

I make that suggestion for the reason that, as all Senators know, the Finance Committee must give consideration during this session to legislation intended to extend, and perhaps to amend, the original N. I. R. A. It seems to me that the logical procedure would be to have one investigation, to have it conducted by the committee which will have jurisdiction over the legislation, and thus to avoid the confusion which I believe inevitably will result from having two committees conducting investigations into the same subject.

I should like also to suggest that the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is a member of the Finance Committee; and I do not think I am violating any confidence of the meeting of the Finance Committee when I say that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the chairman of the committee, suggested that if the procedure I have indicated should be adopted, he would be very glad to invite the Senators who are particularly interested in the subject but who are not members of the Finance Committee to sit in with the committee in the conduct of the investigation.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just a moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HARRISON. I do.

Mr. BORAH. Manifestly, we cannot dispose of this matter hastily. It seems to me the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] ought to be permitted to proceed, and then we may discuss this matter.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Very well; that is satisfactory to me.

WORK-RELIEF PROGRAM

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, as I undertook to state a moment ago, I am thoroughly of the opinion that every single Member of this great body is desirous of maintaining the standard of living of the workers of the United States of America. I make that statement unhesitatingly, knowing that while those who sit beyond the center aisle are members of an opposing political party, they are human and they are interested in the great producers, the workers of this country, as are we on this side of the aisle.

No country ever had a leader who was more humane or more thoroughly interested in the toilers of his country than our own beloved President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. Knowing that not only our great leader but every man affiliated with the present administration is interested in the solution of the problems of this trying time, I take this opportunity to give expression to my thoughts in reference to the subject which has been brought to the attention of every Member of this body by way of the McCarran amendment to the public-works joint resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have been very much interested in hearing the Senator's proposed amendment read to the Senate. From a parliamentary standpoint, however, I do not see how the Senator's amendment can possibly be considered until the action of the Senate in adopting the McCarran amendment shall be reconsidered. The Senator is not prepared to move for a reconsideration of the vote now, is he?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No; I am not.

Mr. CONNALLY. How is the Senator to get his amendment before the Senate? How can we consider it, unless the action of the Senate with regard to the adoption of the McCarran amendment shall be reconsidered?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does not the recommitment of the joint resolution to the Committee on Appropriations automatically undo whatever the Senate did with respect to the McCarran amendment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not so sure about that. I consulted a parliamentary authority here this morning, and he took the view that when the joint resolution went back to the committee it went back in the form in which it existed at the time. Of course, the committee could report back a recommendation that the McCarran amendment be rejected. I am not a parliamentary authority, and I am not prepared to say.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know that a few days ago we sent back to the Committee on Banking and Currency a bill to which an amendment had been attached, and when the bill came back into the Senate it was considered de novo and as if it had not been previously reported.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope that is the practice.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I think undoubtedly that is the rule, and I think that has been the unbroken precedent of the Senate. Of course, the joint resolution is not before the Senate. I do not understand that the Senator from North Carolina is offering an amendment. He has had the proposed amendment read as the basis for some remarks he is making.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The Senator from Arkansas is entirely correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from North Carolina for giving me opportunity to interrupt him. I quite agree with the Senator that the matter ought to be thoroughly considered, and I was wondering how we can attain the end of voting on the Senator's amendment unless we have an opportunity here in the Senate to again consider the whole subject.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the McCarran amendment to the public-works joint resolution makes it mandatory upon the Government to pay to the workers who are taken from the relief rolls, and who are given employment upon public-works projects in this country, opportunity to enjoy the wage scales prevailing in the various and sundry sections of this country.

The chief argument offered against the McCarran amendment, for which amendment I voted, for which I have no apologies to make, and for which amendment I would unhesitatingly vote again were it to come before us in the same form, is that the payment of the prevailing wage scale throughout this country would, it is said, unquestionably interfere with industry.

Mr. President, I am not in accord with that argument. Were I in accord with the argument, and the presentations made by various and sundry men in this body, my attitude no doubt would have been different, because I, like other Members of this body, am desirous of aiding industry, as we all know that good times will not return, that prosperity will not come back, until the opportunity is found to place at work, to give remunerative employment to, the toilers, the workers, the builders of America.

In making that remark I wish to say that I, and all other fair-minded individuals, recognize the fact that labor is just as dependent upon industry as industry is dependent upon labor. We all know that we cannot possibly have a return of the good days of the past until industry has been given a helping hand and lifted to the level of former days.

None of us is desirous of hampering industry. None of us is desirous of doing one single thing that may be construed as a hindrance to the advance of industry and, therefore, the return of prosperity.

Mr. President, I stand here saying to the Members of this body that, in my humble opinion, the McCarran amendment will not in any sense hamper industry in this country. But those who are not in accord with the views we have expressed on this floor, by word of mouth, and likewise by vote, say that paying the prevailing wage in the various sections throughout the United States will hamper industry through the Government giving employment to the laborers

of the land who otherwise would be absorbed by industry. Let us see about that.

I have had read a provision which I hope will be considered by the committee to which it should be referred. That provision meets every single argument that has been presented by anyone upon this floor in the particular to which I have referred. It is said that if the toilers, the laborers of this land, are paid the prevailing wage, the great masses of the country who are unemployed will flock to Government work and thereby hinder and hamper and delay the return of recovery, because they will work for the Government rather than work for private industry.

Very well. Granting, for the time being, for the sake of the argument, that that assertion and that those statements be true, I bring now to the attention of Senators the proposed amendment to the McCarran amendment, calling for the payment of the prevailing wage initially throughout the country, but with the proviso that if at any time it should be found that paying the prevailing wage scale is hampering, injuring, interfering with, or delaying the recovery of industry, all that our great leader has to do is to give notification to the effect that it is hampering and injuring industry and recovery, and in that community or in those communities the prevailing wage scale need not be paid.

Mr. President, it has been said that labor is unreasonable. Some have gone so far as to say that the laborers, the toilers of this country, are overpaid. I stand here unblushingly and unhesitatingly state to this body that I do not believe the laborers, the workers of this country, have ever been overpaid, and I thank our great Heavenly Father above that the toilers, the laborers, the workers of this country, who are the producers of all our wealth, in the social life of this world stand many stages above, many stages removed from the unfortunate laborers of the rest of the world.

Mr. President, I voted for the McCarran amendment because I felt that I was voting for a living wage for the workers of this country. I voted for the McCarran amendment because I believed that requiring the prevailing wage scale to be paid to the toilers and the workers of America would not be detrimental to the recovery of industry. However, if, as is said, the adoption of the McCarran amendment will hamper the return of prosperity because it will result in delaying the recovery of industry, my amendment to the McCarran amendment, if it shall be accepted, will unquestionably meet every single argument advanced by those who have opposed us by speech and by vote.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. Reference has been made to the high level of wages in this country. I wish to ask the Senator if it is not his experience, and if it is not the experience of those who have investigated the matter, that labor in the United States is more efficient than in any other country in the world, and that, as a matter of fact, the laborers of this country turn out goods in almost every industry at a lower cost per unit than they do in any other country of the world?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have the impression that what the Senator has said by way of the inquiry he has directed to me is unquestionably true and correct. Pursuing that thought, I say to the able Senator from Montana that the laborers, the workers of America, are without peer in any corner of this hemisphere. I believe that a living wage should be given to the producers of this country.

Mr. President, while I have the opportunity, I desire to state, so that none may be in doubt as to my position, that I have always felt that labor heretofore has not received its fair portion of the wealth produced by it in this country; and I am fortunate to be able to look upon a noble leader from the great State of Alabama [Mr. BLACK], who for years upon years has given expression to the same thought and made the same statement, not only within this Chamber but likewise in every section of the country and in every single one of the sixty-odd counties of the great Commonwealth which he represents.

Mr. President, judging from some of the letters and telegrams I have received from my State of North Carolina, I

am thoroughly convinced of the fact that the McCarran amendment is grossly misunderstood. A great many people are of the belief and are of the impression that should the McCarran amendment be adopted, laborers and mechanics will make hundreds upon hundreds of dollars per month. Such is not my understanding of the amendment, Mr. President. My understanding is that a certain amount has been calculated upon, an average has been taken, which has been set at \$50 a month, an amount which it has been considered would be sufficient to feed a man and his wife and his children. This average of \$50 a month has been struck. It is my understanding, Mr. President, that if the McCarran amendment should be finally adopted, a man making \$5 a day would be given approximately 10 days' work in the month, making a total of \$50, the average which has been approximated and struck. Then thereafter during the remainder of the month, if he so pleased, he might seek employment with private industry.

Mr. President, so misunderstood is the McCarran amendment that some of its opponents are going to such lengths as to say that if it should be finally adopted, it would result in killing all the public-works projects in the United States. I wish to say, Mr. President, that if all the public-works projects in the United States are killed, they will not be killed by any vote of mine. I stand here now saying to the Members of this great body that I am 100 percent in accord with the President's idea to create, by way of appropriation, a great public-works fund; and I say now that I shall—and with pleasure—support the measure offered by the President of the United States calling for an appropriation of \$4,880,000,000. I do not think the amount is too small. I think the President's ideas about it are exactly right. If it comes to the point where we need more money to bring about a return of prosperity in this country, Mr. President, I shall vote for \$2,000,000,000 more on top of the \$4,000,000,000.

Mr. President, why not accept the amendment which I propose to the McCarran amendment? It will meet every argument, it will answer every censure made by those who oppose the McCarran amendment, because in that opposition one of the prime things asserted is that if we make it mandatory upon the Government to pay the laborers, the toilers of the country, the wage scale prevalent in every section and subdivision of the United States it will be detrimental to industry because of taking the laborers from industry and giving them to the Government. Granting that to be true, as I said a moment ago, that argument is met by the amendment I propose to the McCarran amendment. None of us wants to hamper or halt, none of us wants to discourage industry, because we know that labor is dependent upon industry; and labor knows it because labor is reasonable.

Mr. President, let us accept my amendment; and if those in authority ascertain that the payment of the prevailing wage scale in any section of the United States is detrimental to industry by way of the Government absorbing labor, all the President will have to do is to give notice to the effect that such prevailing wage scale is detrimental.

For those who did not hear my proposed amendment read, I desire to read it again:

Provided, however, That the President is hereby authorized to examine the facts and determine whether the payment of such prevailing wage in any locality is subversive of the maintenance or recovery of private industry or otherwise detrimental thereto; and in the event that the President finds that the payment of such prevailing wage is so subversive or detrimental, and shall issue a proclamation so declaring, then within 10 days thereafter he shall be and is authorized to direct the payment of such scale of wages in such locality as he shall determine.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I believe the public-works bill will pass the Senate in substantially the same form as it was originally reported to the Senate; that is to say, it will not contain the McCarran amendment.

I have been in the two Houses of Congress 24 years, 6 in the House and 18 in the Senate. During that time the Congress has passed scores, indeed, if my recollection is correct, more than a hundred important labor bills. Most of these measures for the advancement of labor I have ap-

proved, I have worked for, and supported. I have supported labor when it only had a few friends. I have supported it when it had many friends.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?
Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I desire respectfully to suggest that the measure be reported back to the Senate with my provision contained in it. I merely wish to make that statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator interrupt me a little later and have the interruption come at the end of my remarks? I will be obliged to him if he will do that.

Almost uniformly during that entire period I have supported labor legislation, because I honestly believe in protecting the rights of the man who toils and labors. I take great pride in the record I have made concerning labor, and I believe that labor in America has accomplished more, has developed and advanced more during those 24 years than during all its previous history.

Now, coming to the so-called "McCarran amendment", let me say that, if the McCarran amendment were adopted, I believe it would have a tendency in my State and in all other States to cause perhaps hundreds of thousands of men and women who labor in private industry to leave those places in private industry and secure Government employment under House Joint Resolution 117. Such a condition would not be good for the country and it would not be good for labor.

What the administration is undertaking by the joint resolution is to do away with the dole and give men and women who are now on the dole, as well as other unemployed, employment on public projects. To fix the rate of pay so high and make it so attractive as to cause people who now have employment to seek places on the Government pay roll would be destructive of the purposes of the measure.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will permit me, I will yield to him in a few moments.

Mr. WHEELER. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, we all knew when we provided for it that the dole was a temporary expedient and was adopted only as a last resort. No government can see its citizens, men, women, and children, starve; but every thoughtful person agrees that we must get rid of the dole at the earliest possible moment, and that is what the work-relief measure undertakes to do. If we can do away with the dole and put men and women to work where they will be self-respecting citizens again and not dependents on relief, it will add tremendously to their own well-being and happiness and to the economic recovery of the entire country.

The measure as it was reported to the Senate contained the following direction to the President:

SEC. 6. The President is authorized to fix the rates of wages of all persons compensated out of the funds appropriated by this joint resolution and may fix different rates for various types of work, which rates need not be uniform throughout the United States.

In the event the President, or such official or agency of Government as he may select, shall determine after an investigation that the rate of wages paid is affecting adversely or is likely to decrease the prevailing rates of wages paid for any work of a similar nature in any city, town, village, or other civil division of the State in which the work is located, or in the District of Columbia, the President, or the official or agency designated by him, shall—

The provision is not merely permissive; it says the President shall—

immediately fix the rate of wages at an amount not less than the prevailing rate of wages paid for work of a similar nature in such locality.

As a friend of labor, I should greatly prefer this amendment reported by the committee to the so-called "McCarran amendment." If the administration of the measure were to be reposed in the hands of a President opposed to labor, there might be something in the contention of the proponents of the McCarran amendment; but such is not the case.

From my own personal knowledge, President Roosevelt is vastly more favorable to labor than have been any of his predecessors, and he has done more for labor than probably

all his predecessors combined. That is the record of our President with regard to labor.

Mr. President, as indicative of how sympathetic the present administration has been with the cause of labor, I submit a list of measures passed by Congress during the last session with reference to labor, all of which, I understand, had the cordial support of the administration and a majority of the Congress.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Wagner National Employment System Act.
The Roads Employment Act.
Insurance Company Loan Act.
The Kick-Back Racket Act.
Labor Disputes Joint Resolution.
Dill-Crosser Railway Labor Act.
Emergency Railroad Transportation Act of 1933.
Railroad Retirement Act.
National Industrial Recovery Act.
Civil Works-Emergency Relief Act.
Wagner-Lewis \$500,000,000 Emergency Relief Act.
Civilian Conservation Corps Reforestation Relief Act.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, under these circumstances, it is incomprehensible to me how labor can oppose leaving in the hands of the President the administration of the joint resolution under the terms of the provision just quoted. The President is directed by the measure itself, and it becomes mandatory upon him, to pay the prevailing wage if it be found that the rate of pay provided is affecting adversely the prevailing wage scale. After all that President Roosevelt has done for the cause of labor during the 2 years he has been in office, if the laboring man cannot trust him to administer properly the proposed law, then it cannot trust anyone. This measure, in my judgment, means 10, nay, 50 times as much to the laboring people of this country as it means to all the rest of our citizenship combined. From the standpoint of labor it is the most important measure that has been proposed since I have been a Member of the Congress. There are still 8,000,000, or thereabouts, out of employment. The enactment of the joint resolution would furnish work to 3,500,000 of that number, and in times such as these nothing could be more important to that class of our citizens than to get as many of them back to work as possible. So, in my judgment, it is most essential to the laboring interests of this country that the measure be passed at the earliest practicable moment and for some of their number and some of their friends to attempt to thwart the passage of a great piece of legislation such as this, which is almost entirely in their interest, seems to me to be an impediment which ought not to be thrown in its way.

Ah, Senators, let us not be deceived. This measure is in the interest of labor; it is in the interest of the unemployed; it is in the interest of good citizenship; it is in the interest of doing away with the depression. Let none of us deceive ourselves; do not let us put any further obstacle in the way of the joint resolution, but let it be passed as recommended by the committee; for it means, I repeat, more for the laboring men in this country than any other measure that has ever been brought before the Congress.

I wish to urge my laboring friends who need the work so badly to protest to those who are thwarting the passage of the measure not further to oppose it. I know that this measure is in the interest of the laboring people of my State, and I believe it is in the interest of the laboring people of every other State, and I hope they will speak out in their own best interest.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. In just a moment I will be through, and I will then yield to the Senator.

I call especially the attention of Senators who are proposing to present another amendment; I call the attention of my handsome and distinguished friend from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the author of the McCarran amendment, to what I am now going to say. As a matter of fact, the provision of the joint resolution as reported is directly in line with the practices of labor in their own organizations. When they have to go on strike, as they sometimes do, the organi-

zation affords relief to the men on strike, but it does not pay the unfortunate strikers the full amount of the prevailing wage in the locality. I digress long enough to ask any Senator from any State did he ever hear, when such a crisis has arisen, of a labor organization paying the prevailing wage?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator let me answer the question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will in a moment. Did the Senator from Montana or any other Senator ever hear under such circumstances of paying the prevailing wage so as to keep the men on strike unemployed?

Mr. WHEELER. Will the Senator let me answer?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, the labor organizations never pay the prevailing wage except when they furnish work, but when they furnish work every labor organization in the United States has paid the prevailing wage. When it puts members on a dole, that is not true. We are not asking that when put on a dole they shall be given the prevailing wage. All we are asking is that when it comes to erecting buildings and other structures, when the relief workers are put in competition with private industry, that they be paid the prevailing wage.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator name where a single labor organization in this country has ever paid the prevailing wage to strikers engaged on other work?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, I cannot.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to have the Senator do it.

Mr. WHEELER. But I can tell the Senator that when they put men on their pay roll to do certain things in the coal strike, when those men were working they were paid the prevailing wage. In Montana when they put men to work, differentiating from when they were giving them a dole, they paid the prevailing wage.

Mr. McKELLAR. If that has ever been done in this country I have never heard of it, and I do not know of it. I do not believe it ever occurred, and I challenge the Senator to give the names of the people and the occasion when it was done.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator asked me to answer a question and will not permit me to answer it. I am saying to the Senator that by going to the files of the United Mine Workers he will find that when work was given to members of the United Mine Workers, when they were put on the pay roll to do certain work, they were paid the prevailing wage. He can find the same thing with reference to the mines in the Northwest. When they put the men to work, differentiating from when they actually gave them a dole, they paid the prevailing wage.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should be very happy if the Senator would furnish the facts and figures about the assertion he makes.

Mr. WHEELER. I am simply saying it, and if the Senator wants to get the facts and figures, all he has to do is to ask John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, or the American Federation of Labor, or any of the other labor organizations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Give us the facts.

Mr. WHEELER. I am giving the facts.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think so.

Mr. President, here is what happens. The labor organization pays enough to keep its members, men and women, free from want, and that is right and proper, and I honor and respect them for it. In doing this, they are entirely within their rights. It is precisely what is being attempted to be done in this crisis in our country. That is exactly what the joint resolution is undertaking to do—to tide over those who are so unfortunate as to be without employment in this unusual depression, until private industry may take up the slack. The measure as reported to the Senate is directly in line with the precedent set by labor itself.

Mr. President, I make these remarks as a friend of labor. I challenge anyone interested in the matter to examine my record of 24 years on the subject of labor. Someone had that record prepared not long ago, and I know whereof I

speak. I am not one who is merely at times for them; I have uniformly been for labor, and I say here and now that in voting for the joint resolution as reported by the committee, I never in my life acted more sincerely in the interests of labor.

I honestly believe, Mr. President, that some of our labor friends are standing in the way of the enactment of a law which would benefit labor more than any other measure ever passed by the Congress. I urge my thoughtful friends on the other side not to stand in the way of this splendid labor measure, because I believe, indeed I know, it is a labor measure. Do not be deceived by the thought that it is not a labor measure. The joint resolution is going to give labor employment where they now have none. I do not believe we are justified in opposing the measure on the ground of the McCarran amendment when the measure is so beneficial to the cause of labor.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wish to say to my good friend the Senator from Tennessee, for whom I have great admiration and a great deal of affection, that I am not opposing the joint resolution. I am for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. The trouble is the Senator voted to send it back to the committee.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am going to vote for it. I will tell the people of America that I am for all the public works that are necessary. I know that in Great Britain they are coming out of the depression, and how? They went off the gold standard and then poured billions upon billions of dollars into their public-works program. I know England is coming out of the depression, because they have over there federal housing acts similar to ours which helped the heavy industries and started things on the upgrade. That is what we have to have in this country.

I am not opposing the joint resolution. I am going to vote for the \$4,000,000,000 appropriation and for the \$4,880,000,000. If the President of the United States, our great leader, who is a friend of the people, wants \$6,000,000,000, I shall vote for \$6,000,000,000, if it will help. If that shall not be sufficient, I will vote for another billion. However, the impression has gone out over the country that those of us on this side and on the other side of the Chamber who voted for the McCarran amendment are trying to kill the measure and that we do not trust the President. That is all poppycock.

Mr. McKELLAR. If it is all poppycock, let us get together and vote for the joint resolution as the committee originally reported it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is what I shall do with this exception. If the Senate will adopt my amendment to the McCarran amendment, it will be found that it meets the provisions of the bill. Let us see what the joint resolution provides.

Mr. McKELLAR. I regret the Senator has a proviso attached to his proposal.

Mr. REYNOLDS. It would help us. It is such a proviso as will satisfy everybody. No one could then be criticized. Those who voted for the McCarran amendment are being criticized. Those who voted against it are being criticized. I am being criticized and my good friend the Senator from Tennessee is being criticized because he voted the other way. We do not want any criticism. [Laughter.]

We are not going to straddle any fence. I hate a straddler. I hate a man who stands so that the people cannot tell where he stands. We should stand on one side of the fence or the other, or else take the fence away, and then the people cannot tell where we are standing! [Laughter.] If the Senator will vote for my proviso, he will find that it will take Senators out of the hole, and everybody will be sitting on top of the ground. [Laughter.]

Let us see what the joint resolution provides.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am going to yield the floor if the Senator is going to insist on taking that attitude.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from North Carolina let me in my own time ask him a question? Does the Senator really think we should adopt his amendment after the committee have considered and worked over the matter for weeks; indeed, I believe for more than a month, as they had spent much time on it when I returned from the Philippines? After the committee has gone into it so carefully and has brought out a provision directing the President, if the prevailing wage is about to be interfered with in the slightest, to pay the prevailing wage, does not the Senator think he ought to have enough confidence in our President, who is being held up to us by the Senator as our great leader, to leave the matter in the hands of the President?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the Senator think he ought to have enough confidence in the President to stand by the joint resolution as reported by the committee?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say to my good friend from Tennessee that it is not a question of having confidence or not having confidence in the President. We all have confidence in our great leader. We all have the greatest confidence in him.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield so that I may ask the Senator from North Carolina a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. LOGAN. The Senator from North Carolina is resenting the statements which are going about the country that he and his associates who voted for the McCarran amendment are opposing the passage of the joint resolution, or rather preventing it becoming effective. I should like to ask the Senator if he did not know when he voted for that amendment that he was voting for that which would bring about a veto from the great President whom the Senator admires so greatly? Must he not assume the responsibility and can he escape the responsibility for having voted for the McCarran amendment when he knew that by so doing he was deferring the possibility of the joint resolution being enacted into law and made it impossible for it to operate because the President had said he would veto it in that form?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I answer the Senator from Kentucky by saying no!

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish merely to say that I believe the measure is going to pass substantially as reported by the committee, and I believe it ought to pass substantially in that form. I am for the speedy enactment of the measure. I oppose the McCarran amendment as being wholly unnecessary, and say that, in my judgment, that amendment is the only thing in the way of the speedy passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. BANKHEAD obtained the floor.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina rose to ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee. The Senator from Tennessee then yielded the floor, and the Chair has now recognized the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I ask for recognition.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama has been recognized.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. BANKHEAD. For how long a time does the Senator wish me to yield to him?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Oh, for about 5 minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well; I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, my amendment provides that if the prevailing wage paid in the respective political subdivisions of the country shall be found to be detrimental to the workers and the laborers, then the President shall

have the right to issue a proclamation setting aside and wiping out and destroying the prevailing-wage provision in that section.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to my good friend from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to correct a statement the Senator made. He said he was receiving a great deal of criticism from the people of North Carolina about his vote and that I was receiving a great deal of criticism, he had no doubt, from my State about my vote. The Senator is entirely mistaken. Up to this time I have not received a word of criticism from anyone in my State for the vote I cast. I have received approval so far as is indicated by letters and telegrams which have come up to this day. I don't believe I will receive any unless some one from Washington suggests they be sent. I did receive a single letter of disapproval from a gentleman in Pennsylvania, and I wrote him a letter in line with what I have stated here on the floor of the Senate this morning. This is the only criticism I have received.

The Senator from North Carolina must not include me among those who received criticism because of their votes. I did not make my speech because of any criticism, because I have not received any. Really the letter from Pennsylvania which I just mentioned is the only letter of criticism I have received.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I understood the Senator to say that the letter he received from Pennsylvania was a letter of criticism. I assume that all of us have received such letters.

Mr. President, let us look at this joint resolution for just a moment:

Resolved, etc., That in order to protect and to promote the general welfare, by (1) providing relief from the hardships attributable to widespread unemployment and conditions resulting therefrom, (2) alleviating distress, and (3)—

This measure has been drafted and designed, and it is intended and proposed, to do what? It is proposed for the purpose of—

improving living and working conditions.

I ask you, Mr. President, if paying wages such as are proposed by the proponents of this measure as reported from the committee is improving living conditions or wage conditions? It is not.

My good friend from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has said something about the dole. I desire here and now to make clear my position upon that subject. I am against the dole. I think that giving people a dole, as we have been doing, creates indolence, and does not do any good to anybody or anything, anywhere. Therefore, I am for the public-works joint resolution. I am going to vote for \$4,000,000,000, or, if we need it, I will vote for six or seven billion dollars.

My amendment is right in line with the measure itself. I desire to read it.

On page 7, the second paragraph of section 6 is as follows:

In the event the President, or such official or agency of government as he may select, shall determine after an investigation that the rate of wages paid is affecting adversely or is likely to decrease the prevailing rates of wages paid for any work of a similar nature in any city, town, village, or other civil division of the State in which the work is located, or in the District of Columbia, the President, or the official or agency designated by him—

Shall do what?—

shall immediately fix the rate of wages at an amount not less than the prevailing rate of wages paid for work of a similar nature in such locality.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President—

Mr. REYNOLDS. I surrender the floor to the Senator. The Senator was good enough to yield to me. I surrender the floor to the Senator, and in so doing I desire to assure him that I am very grateful and appreciative of his kindness.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, one question involved in the McCarran amendment seems to be very differently

understood by Members of the Senate. A correct understanding on that point is highly important, as the subject has been emphasized by various Senators in speeches in the Senate. The question is whether the administration of the McCarran amendment would or would not increase the cost to the Government of carrying out the work-relief program and require an additional appropriation to provide a year's relief work.

It has been positively stated by Senators that the McCarran amendment would not increase the cost and that the same results would be obtained by paying the prevailing wage for fewer hours of work. It has been just as positively stated by Senators that the McCarran amendment would greatly increase the cost and much more money would be required to operate for 1 year and there would be much less permanent assets resulting from the expenditure.

While the solution of that question may not be decisive with any Senator in the matter of his action upon the McCarran amendment, nevertheless, it is of great importance that the controversy should be further developed on account of the emphasis given to it by Senators who have voted for and against the McCarran amendment.

Supporters of the McCarran amendment have asserted that the only difference in the two plans—prevailing wage and security wage—is the number of hours a worker may be required to work. They insist that by paying the prevailing wage scale a sufficient number of hours to afford the relief worker the monthly security wage—estimated to average \$50—the two plans will be completely harmonized.

They have further asserted that as a result of the combining of the two plans no more money will be needed, and that the cost of the Government will be the same.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MINTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let me finish my statement first. Then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to correct a statement made by the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; I do not yield now. After I finish I will yield to any question the Senator desires to propound.

Mr. President, it is evidently true that if three and one-half million men are paid the same amount of money for working 65 hours a month that they would be paid for working 130 hours a month, the amount paid as wages would be the same. The question then recurs, Would there be additional cost to the Government, in carrying out the various work projects, from letting the work stand idle all the time except approximately 10 days in the month during which the workers would be paid the prevailing wage scale and earn a month's security wages? It seems clear to me that such a work program would necessarily involve large additional cost. It is contemplated that, wherever practical, the work projects shall be done under contract. It is therefore necessary to look at the problem from the standpoint of the contractors who will bid on the projects.

Under the prevailing wage scale the work hours could be broken down either into a fixed number of hours per week or per month. If the weekly unit were used, the work could proceed 3 hours a day for 5 days, or 6 hours a day for 2½ days. If the monthly unit were used, the work would proceed for 10 days of 6 hours in the month. These calculations are made upon the assumption that the average prevailing-wage scale will cost per hour about twice as much as the average security-wage scale would cost per hour. That assumption is supported by a statement and calculation furnished the Committee on Appropriation by a representative of the Federal Relief Administration.

When a contractor made his estimates upon a given project he would necessarily take into consideration the fact that his machinery and equipment would not be in use except for 15 hours in a week, or for 10½ days of 6 hours in a month. He would also have to take into consideration the fact that

his superintendent and foreman and his office force and other necessary personnel in his organization were working on the project for only a total of 10½ days of 6 hours in each month. In short, his personnel organization and his equipment and machinery must be used for an entire year while actually employed only about 60 hours in each month in the year.

While it is practically impossible for one not thoroughly acquainted with the cost of construction to make any accurate figures, the fact stands without any serious dispute that every contractor would be obliged to include in his bid a very substantial amount to cover his stand-by relations to the project for probably more than twice the time that would be required under normal contract construction conditions. Adverse weather conditions would be an important factor when a project would require a year for completion which under normal conditions would be completed in less than 6 months. This is particularly true in highway, flood control, and erosion work.

The same conditions would apply to work done on force account by the Government or municipalities. While it is difficult to estimate in dollars and cents the additional cost that would necessarily accrue under the McCarran amendment, it is clear, at least to me, that it would involve a very large additional expenditure, and that fact would exhaust the appropriation more quickly and would of necessity result in the elimination of projects which otherwise would be provided for.

It is well to take into consideration the relative average efficiency of those on the relief rolls as compared with the average efficiency of those being paid the prevailing wage scale in private industry. It is undoubtedly true that many on the relief rolls are as efficient as the best workers now normally employed. It is also generally recognized that when private industry finds it necessary to reduce the number of employees relative efficiency is a large factor in selecting the workers to be separated from the service. The application of that rule has been specially hurtful to those who have grown old.

It is hoped, in the interest of the financial status of the Government and of the lightening of the load upon the taxpayers, that many of the projects will be to a large extent self-liquidating, either through the repayment of the amount expended by the Government or in the construction of public works, such as roads, rivers and harbors, and flood control, which are of a permanent nature, and which, at some time in the future, would otherwise call for appropriations. Surely we do not want to put into operation a needless and wasteful program. The McCarran amendment would inevitably have that result. The volume of construction would be greatly reduced without taking into account the increase in cost for the projects actually completed.

It has been suggested in debate that the Government surely does not expect to get overtime from the relief workers, and the intimation has been made that it would be unfair and unjust to those upon the relief rolls to expect from them, on mere security wages, the same quality and quantity of work rendered by workers in private industry under the prevailing wage scale. The fact that full equivalent of performance, as compared with the workers in private industry under the prevailing wage scale, is not contemplated is shown by the estimate furnished the committee indicating that work would be limited to 6 hours a day and 5 days a week.

We should not lose sight of the fact that the work-relief bill is intended to provide made work for the benefit primarily of those upon the relief rolls. I am one of those who believe that relief workers will come nearer having a restored morale if they believe that they are earning the money paid them by the Government and earning it in the way of results from their labor. It seems to me that a program under which these relief workers are employed only about 15 hours during the week, or for about 10 days during the month, will more definitely impress upon them that they are being dealt with from a standpoint of Government charity than would appear if they were occupied on the work in a more normal way and for a longer time. The fact must not

be overlooked that the additional time given to work is not earning time lost to these people. In short, they are on the relief rolls because they cannot get any sort of paid work.

It has been frequently stated in the discussions here that one amendment should not lead to the defeat of the bill. The trouble with that one amendment under consideration is that it amounted to a substitute for the real purpose of the bill as declared by the President in his address to Congress. The McCarran amendment changed in a vital way the entire philosophy of the original bill. It had been definitely stated on the floor of the Senate that with the McCarran amendment adopted the President would veto the bill. After that amendment I could see no good purpose in proceeding for many days with a bill which we all knew could not become a law. Every Member of the Senate knew that the bill could not be passed over the President's veto. We had no right to assume that the House of Representatives would insist upon the elimination of the McCarran amendment, and we had no right to assume that any Member of this body who voted for the McCarran amendment would change his vote. The responsibility at that time rested upon the Senate. It took deliberate action, well knowing that the action taken, in the viewpoint of the President, worked a complete change in the administration's announced program.

By the recommittal of the bill to the Appropriations Committee time has been secured for reconsideration of all the problems involved and for the application of the best judgment of the Members of the Senate in working out a satisfactory adjustment of the controversy which has endangered the bill.

Personally I very greatly regret the harsh criticisms, from certain sources, of my colleagues whose sense of duty led them to support the McCarran amendment. I feel sure that some Senators who are opposed to the entire work-relief program were not governed in their vote on the McCarran amendment because of their anxiety over the effect on the prevailing wage scale. At the same time, I am absolutely confident that many Senators who voted for the McCarran amendment did so under the abiding conviction that it was better to have no work-relief bill than to jeopardize the prevailing wage scale. Those who voted from that viewpoint are to be commended for standing by their convictions. If I had been convinced that the President's plan, if left unamended, would have lowered the prevailing wage scale, I am free to say that I should have voted for the adoption of the McCarran amendment. Being firmly convinced, however, with all the factors considered, and knowing full well the extremes to which the President would go to prevent impairment of the prevailing wage scale, I cast my vote against the McCarran amendment.

I sincerely hope that, without further indulging in charges and countercharges, and without further insistence that some Senators cast their votes as a result of the pressure of organized labor, and without further charges on the part of organized labor that those who did not vote for the McCarran amendment are at heart unfriendly to labor, some formula may be worked out and agreed upon that will save the President's work-relief program and at the same time will give satisfactory assurance to the representatives of organized labor that the prevailing wage scale will not be in any way adversely affected under the program.

I have full confidence in the wisdom and patriotism of the leaders on both sides of the controversy. The results are too important to justify pride of opinion, enthusiasm of victory, or sting of defeat; too important to justify real statesmen and true representatives of their people, whether in Congress or in industry, or in the fields of organized labor, in permitting the breaking down and abandonment of a program which holds out such strong hope for better conditions to millions of American distressed people.

The leaders on both sides of this controversy are in full agreement that the work-relief plan must not be administered in a way to jeopardize the prevailing wage scale. Surely, when two great groups are in full accord on the objectives of the measure and are also in full accord that possible evils to workers engaged in private industry must be

avoided, some formula can be agreed upon to accomplish the desired results.

I have believed that the Russell amendment, under a sympathetic administration, should be a satisfactory assurance to those who are apprehensive that the President's plan for security wage on Government-made work will destroy the prevailing wage scale in private industry.

WILLIAM P. MACCRACKEN, JR.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, this morning the Senate learned, by the report of the Sergeant at Arms, Chesley W. Jurney, that William P. MacCracken, Jr., had been committed on February 26, 1935, to the District of Columbia Jail for the period of 10 days prescribed in Senate Resolution 185, agreed to on February 14, 1934.

After the report of the Sergeant at Arms, I asked leave to have printed in the RECORD following the report a statement by Mr. MacCracken referring to his situation. As I promised to do, I now read that statement:

After careful consideration I have concluded not to petition the Supreme Court for a rehearing of my case, and in accordance with the stipulation I entered into with the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate I am surrendering to serve my sentence. This I do conscious of the fact that I have done no wrongful act.

In this connection I desire to explain my position in connection with this controversy. Since 1929 I have been practicing law in Washington. Last February the Senate Air Mail Committee issued a subpoena calling on me to deliver to that committee all correspondence and other documents in my possession relating to air-mail contracts. My understanding of the legal and moral duty of a lawyer to his clients was and is that he cannot disclose their communications to him, written or oral, without their consent. I immediately made available to the Senate committee every document in my possession excepting those which I believed could not be released without the consent of my clients, and at the committee's request I at once asked their instructions. As fast as my clients consented to the production before the Senate committee of their communications to me I instantly made them available. Before I heard from all of my clients the Senate issued a warrant for my arrest for not delivering over my client's papers. Before the service of the warrant all of my clients had waived their privilege and all papers then in my possession were delivered to the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate.

There has been a great deal in the public press about the destruction of papers in this case. The only papers involved in this controversy that were destroyed were those delivered by my partner without my prior knowledge or consent to a representative of one of our clients, and those my partner believed were of a personal nature and not covered by the subpoena. There was not one scintilla of evidence before the Senate that in any way connected me personally with the destruction of any papers whatsoever. I cannot make this too strong.

The papers that were removed from my office with my consent were, after my request, all turned over to the Senate committee before the contempt proceedings were instituted. The clients involved in this latter transaction were cited for contempt and acquitted by the Senate.

After the Senate's citation to show cause why I should not be punished for contempt was served upon me and they had adopted rules for the trial which made that body grand jury, prosecutor, trial jury, and judge, I concluded that the Senate under these circumstances, in attempting to try and punish a private citizen, was violating the Constitution of the United States. I took the case to the courts to test the jurisdiction of the Senate.

The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia sustained me in this view. The Supreme Court held adversely to my contention. In sustaining the power of the Senate, the Court declined to consider the facts other than to ascertain whether the charges made by the Senate were within its jurisdiction. In effect, the Supreme Court holds that, if the Senate is engaged in a legislative matter and charges a private citizen with an act which, if proven, would constitute an obstruction to the exercise of that function, then the question of guilt or innocence of the party charged and the punishment to be inflicted are questions solely for the determination of the legislative body, notwithstanding the fact that it is a political as contradistinguished from a judicial body.

I believe that some situation will arise in the future which will cause the Court to modify this holding. However, as far as I am concerned, nothing remains but to accept the punishment which the Senate inflicted. This I propose to do.

That is the end of Mr. MacCracken's statement.

Mr. President, in view of what occurred this morning when I asked unanimous consent to have this statement follow the report of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate—in view particularly of the allegation made here, and which has now become a public record, that there are statements contained in Mr. MacCracken's paper which are untrue—I

summon as evidence to the Senate and to the great public of America the Supreme Court of the United States, as the best witness available, that every statement contained in that paper is true. Let me read from the opinion in *Jurney against MacCracken*, handed down by the Supreme Court at the October term, 1934, on February 4, 1935—Mr. Justice Brandeis delivering the opinion of the Court—the following facts; and I ask the Senate's attention to them with reference to whether they parallel the statement made by Mr. MacCracken. I am now reading from that opinion:

MacCracken had been served, on January 31, 1934, with a subpoena duces tecum to appear "instantly" before the committee and to bring all books of account and papers "relating to air mail and ocean mail contracts." The witness appeared on that day; stated that he is a lawyer, member of the firm of MacCracken & Lee, with offices in the District; that he was ready to produce all papers which he lawfully could; but that many of those in his possession were privileged communications between himself and corporations or individuals for whom he had acted as attorney; that he could not lawfully produce such papers without the client first having waived the privilege; and that, unless he secured such a waiver, he must exercise his own judgment as to what papers were within the privilege. He gave, however, to the committee the names of these clients; stated the character of services rendered for each; and, at the suggestion of the committee, telegraphed to each asking whether consent to disclose confidential communications would be given. From some of the clients he secured immediately unconditional consent; and on February 1, produced all the papers relating to the business of the clients who had so consented.

On February 2, before the committee had decided whether the production of all the papers should be compelled despite the claims of privilege, MacCracken again appeared and testified as follows: On February 1 he personally permitted Given, a representative of Western Air Express, to examine, without supervision, the files containing papers concerning that company; and authorized him to take therefrom papers which did not relate to air-mail contracts. Given, in fact, took some papers which did relate to air mail contracts. On the same day, Brittin, vice president of Northwest Airways, Inc., without MacCracken's knowledge, requested, and received from his partner, Lee, permission to examine the files relating to that company's business and to remove therefrom some papers stated by Brittin to have been dictated by him in Lee's office and to be wholly personal and unrelated to matters under investigation by the committee. Brittin removed from the files some papers; took them to his office; and, with a view to destroying them, tore them into pieces and threw the pieces into a waste-paper basket.

Upon the conclusion of MacCracken's testimony on February 2, the committee decided that none of the papers in his possession could be withheld under the claim of privilege. Later that day MacCracken received from the rest of his clients waivers of their privilege; and thereupon promptly made available to the committee all the papers then remaining in the files. On February 3 (after a request therefor by MacCracken), Given restored to the files what he stated were all the papers taken by him. The petition does not allege that any of the papers taken by Brittin were later produced. It avers that, prior to the adoption of the citation for contempt under Resolution 172, MacCracken had produced and delivered to the Senate of the United States, "to the best of his ability, knowledge, and belief, every paper of every kind and description in his possession or under his control, relating in any way to air mail and ocean mail contracts; [and that] on February 5, 1934, * * * all of said papers were turned over and delivered to said Senate committee and since that date they have been, and they now are, in the possession of said committee."

That is the end of the part of the opinion which I am quoting. I now turn back to page 2 of the opinion, and take this extract from it. This is the Court speaking, through Mr. Justice Brandeis:

The claim of privilege hereinafter referred to is no longer an issue. MacCracken's sole contention is that the Senate was without power to arrest him with a view to punishing him, because the act complained of—the alleged destruction and removal of the papers after service of the subpoena—was "the past commission of a completed act which prior to the arrest and the proceedings to punish had reached such a stage of finality that it could not longer affect the proceedings of the Senate or any committee thereof, and which, and the effects of which, had been undone long before the arrest."

Thus it is seen that the statement by Mr. MacCracken of what the issue was is entirely, precisely, exactly according to fact as stated by the Supreme Court. The issue was not the question tried by the Senate of the United States of whether MacCracken was guilty or not guilty of a contempt. The question was not whether MacCracken had destroyed any papers or had not done so. The question was not whether MacCracken had delivered or not delivered all the

papers he was called upon to deliver. The statement of fact, however, shows that the Court had before it the complete and entire innocence of this man of the facts alleged against him, namely, that he had not interfered with the processes of justice, he had not interfered with the proceedings of the Senate in the manner alleged in the complaint, but, on the contrary, had delivered or had caused to be delivered all the papers which were then within his reach.

So the whole question passed upon by the Supreme Court was that which the Supreme Court itself declared, namely, the constitutional question of the power or lack of power of the Senate to punish a citizen of the United States for an act that is so far completed in the past that it cannot and it does not interfere with the processes of legislation.

Now I turn to another part of the Supreme Court's opinion to support this statement in the paper of Mr. MacCracken which I have read, as follows—quoting from page 2:

In sustaining the power of the Senate, the Court declined to consider the facts other than to ascertain whether the charges made by the Senate were within its jurisdiction.

Now let us summon the Supreme Court on that question and see whether or not the statement of Mr. MacCracken is according to the facts. I now read from the opinion on page 7, paragraph third, as follows:

Third. MacCracken contends that he is not punishable for contempt, because the obstruction, if any, which he caused to legislative processes, had been entirely removed and its evil effects undone before the contempt proceedings were instituted. He points to the allegations in the petition for habeas corpus that he had surrendered all papers in his possession; that he was ready and willing to give any additional testimony which the committee might require; that he had secured the return of the papers taken from the files by Given, with his permission; and that he was in no way responsible for the removal and destruction of the papers by Brittin. This contention goes to the question of guilt, not to that of the jurisdiction of the Senate. The contempt with which MacCracken is charged is "the destruction and removal of certain papers." Whether he is guilty, and whether he has so far purged himself of contempt that he does not now deserve punishment, are the questions which the Senate proposes to try. The respondent to the petition did not, by demurring, transfer to the court the decision of those questions. The sole function of the writ of habeas corpus is to have the court decide whether the Senate has jurisdiction to make the determination which it proposes.

And the Court decided it against MacCracken's claim and held—

The judgment of the court of appeals should be reversed, and that of the Supreme Court of the District should be affirmed.

Mr. President, I had no intention to make any remarks about this remarkable condition of public affairs, for nothing that has occurred in years compares with this particular situation to throw light upon what today is taking place in our country. Here is a citizen whose rights—inviolable rights—have been taken from him by vote of the United States Senate. Here is a citizen of the United States serving a sentence of the Senate of the United States upon facts which one of those who voted for his sentence this morning declared showed him to be an innocent man.

I consider that the opinion of the Supreme Court and the statement of William P. MacCracken, Jr., should be placed in the Record for the sake of citizens of the United States of America, and if it will awaken them to the conditions that exist today, or if it will help to arouse them to a defense of human rights, then I will have done more, Mr. President, than I had contemplated.

Moreover, Mr. President, that statement of William P. MacCracken, Jr., when published in the Record of the United States Senate will ever be to the son of that man a sanctuary against the finger of accusation that might be pointed to his father's record in some time of emotional uprising, political or otherwise.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, it is not my thought that the case of Mr. MacCracken should be reviewed by the Senate at this time; nor do I believe that the statement made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who has just taken his seat, is just to the Senate.

It will be recalled, as is stated by the Supreme Court in the opinion to which the Senator from Vermont referred, that the primary contention of Mr. MacCracken did not relate to the question of his guilt or innocence; it related solely

to the power of the Senate to try him for contempt and to reach a conclusion imposing a penalty.

In the proceeding which was instituted by the respondent, Mr. MacCracken, the theory alone was relied upon that the Senate was acting outside its constitutional power. A statement of facts, which I believe to be accurate, is incorporated in the Supreme Court's decision.

Referring to the contention of Mr. MacCracken and his counsel, the Supreme Court says:

The argument is that the power may be used by the legislative body merely as a means of removing an existing obstruction to the performance of its duties; that the power to punish ceases as soon as the obstruction has been removed, or its removal has become impossible.

There was evidence to show that action on the part of Mr. MacCracken had rendered it impossible for him to submit all the papers for which the subpoena duces tecum of the Senate called. He had summoned certain clients and, without exhibiting the papers to the Senate and giving the Senate the opportunity to pass judgment on the relevancy of those papers, had permitted certain clients to withdraw papers which they thought were of a private nature and not related to the subject matter of inquiry.

It is true that he sought to shield himself behind the privilege which attaches to an attorney acting in a professional capacity; but the circumstances did not prove or tend to prove that the task which Mr. MacCracken was performing was a professional task. On the contrary they tended to show and did show that his services were those of a legislative representative frequently called lobbyist.

The Supreme Court did not and could not, under the proceeding which the respondent instituted, pass upon the question of guilt or innocence. That was the province of the Senate. On the 14th of February, 1934, the Senate, by a vote of 62 to 22, adjudged Mr. MacCracken guilty of contempt, and by another vote of 56 to 26 directed that a penalty of 10 days' imprisonment be imposed upon him.

The sole issue in the proceeding which was finally passed upon by the Supreme Court was whether the Senate had power or authority to render the judgment which it did render. It may be recalled that the same issues which the Senator from Vermont raises here now were raised during the trial of Mr. MacCracken. It will be recalled that the contention was made in the trial that if it had passed beyond the power of the respondent, by actions of his own or actions to which he had consented, to comply with the order of the Senate he should be held to have purged himself of contempt and that the Senate would have no authority for further process against him. Now, after the case has gone to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court has said that from the very beginning of the Government the power which the respondent controverted and denied has existed in the two branches of the Congress to try and punish for contempt, the Senator from Vermont places in the Record a statement which reflects upon the integrity of the proceeding of the Senate and which impeaches the correctness of the proceedings of the Supreme Court of the United States.

I sympathize with anyone who is so unfortunate as to find himself under the necessity of suffering a penalty imposed in accordance with law, but it ill becomes the respondent, after he has had a trial in a proceeding which he instituted, limiting the authority of the tribunal according to his own pleasure and according to his right, still to insist that the decision of the Supreme Court was wrong. It ill becomes any Senator, in my judgment, to assert and insist that the respondent has been oppressed or treated unjustly.

The Supreme Court said in its opinion:

The power to punish a private citizen for a past and completed act was exerted by Congress as early as 1795; and since then it has been exercised on several occasions.

The question raised was whether the Congress has the power to punish a private citizen for a past and completed act as in the nature of contempt.

Continuing, the Supreme Court said:

It was asserted before the Revolution, by the colonial assemblies, in imitation of the British House of Commons, and afterward by the Continental Congress and by State legislative bodies. In

Anderson v. Dunn (6 Wheat. 204), decided in 1821, it was held that the House had power to punish a private citizen for an attempt to bribe a Member. No case has been found in which an exertion of the power to punish for contempt has been successfully challenged on the ground that, before punishment, the offending act had been consummated or that the obstruction suffered was irremediable. The statements and opinion in *Marshall v. Gordon*, supra, upon which Mr. MacCracken relies, must be read in the light of the particular facts.

I omit a part of the decision and continue reading:

Here we are concerned, not with an extension of congressional privilege but with vindication of the established and essential privilege of requiring the production of evidence. For this purpose the power to punish for a past contempt is an appropriate means.

The Senate was ridiculed in the trial for its alleged violation of the constitutional rights of the respondent, for seeking to hold him liable for a past and completed act in violation of its process. The Supreme Court having passed upon the subject and sustained the authority of the Senate, we hear again the very same arguments that were made during the progress of the trial. We are told that the conclusion of the Senate in imposing a penalty was unjust; that it constituted a violation of the rights of a citizen.

What right? Of what right has the respondent been deprived? Upon what ground is the Senate now to be told by him, while he is suffering the penalty imposed upon him, that he was treated unjustly, that he was oppressed? Upon what grounds are the findings and the conclusions of the Supreme Court assailed and, by implication, charged to be unjust?

The importance of this case was recognized by the country at large. It involved questions which related to the constitutional power of the Congress to obtain evidence in connection with the performance of legislative duties. The statement of facts contained in the Supreme Court opinion, correctly reviewing the evidence, does not justify an attack on the Senate, or on the integrity and justice of its proceedings.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBINSON. Certainly.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In support of what the able Senator from Arkansas has just said, is it not true that the Supreme Court passed on two questions—first, the jurisdiction of the United States Senate; second, the determination of guilt of Mr. MacCracken—deciding as to the first that the Senate had jurisdiction, and in regard to the second that the Senate had tried, or was planning to try, Mr. MacCracken with a view to a finding of guilt? If that be true, is it not to be assumed that the Supreme Court impliedly found that there had been no denial to Mr. MacCracken of any constitutional rights?

May I also ask the Senator if, in his judgment, the sentence imposed by the Senate, and sustained by the Supreme Court, was not an extremely moderate one under all the circumstances?

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, answering the Senator from Colorado, I do not understand that the Supreme Court passed upon the questions of fact involved in the trial of Mr. MacCracken by the Senate. My understanding is that the one point which was relied upon by Mr. MacCracken was that the Senate had no power to try him at all, had no jurisdiction to impose any penalty upon him. I do not understand that the Court could have passed, under the proceedings which Mr. MacCracken elected to pursue, upon the direct question of his guilt or innocence.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the Senator will permit me, the Supreme Court did, however, hold, did it not, that the Senate had undertaken to determine the question of guilt?

Mr. ROBINSON. Certainly.

Mr. COSTIGAN. And by implication I was suggesting that it thereby held that no constitutional rights had so far been infringed.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I have not read the official report of the opinion; but, as reported in the newspapers, I understood

the Court to say that it did not assume to pass upon the question of guilt or innocence.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; that is what I have said.

Mr. BORAH. It was simply passing upon the question of the jurisdiction of the Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON. In the habeas corpus proceeding which was chosen by Mr. MacCracken as his remedy, the Court, as I understand their decision and as I understand the general principle of the law applicable, could not pass directly upon the question of guilt or innocence. The Court, in its opinion, states, among other things, referring to a contention raised by counsel for the respondent:

This contention goes to the question of guilt, not to that of the jurisdiction of the Senate. The contempt with which MacCracken is charged is "the destruction and removal of certain papers." Whether he is guilty, and whether he has * * * purged himself * * * are the questions which the Senate proposes to try.

It is a well-defined rule of law that in proceedings like that which Mr. MacCracken instituted, the appellate court does not pass upon the weight of the evidence or the credibility of the witnesses. Mr. MacCracken relied upon the contention that the Senate was acting without authority; that it was violating his personal rights in trying him at all and imposing any penalty upon him. When the court held that from the beginning of the Government, and even prior to the adoption of the Constitution, that power and authority existed, it has some relationship, in my opinion, to the contempt itself, and to the manner in which the authority of the Senate was defied and ridiculed in the press of the Nation by the defendant and his counsel.

The significant thing in Mr. MacCracken's present statement is that after he has had recourse to every court in the land, in a proceeding which he himself has instituted and chosen, he comes back with the declaration, incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to the effect that in spite of the decision of the Senate, and the decision of the Supreme Court sustaining it, he is still guiltless, and is still being oppressed.

I do not wish, and I would deem it improper, to retry the case of Mr. MacCracken here; but it does not seem to me that the Senate and the Supreme Court should be put in the wrong after every technicality which the law recognizes and permits, and after every constitutional right which the respondent claims or can claim, has been asserted in legal proceedings.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I am very grateful for the corroboration of my own brief remarks which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Robinson] has given. I see that he agrees with me almost completely about the interpretation of the decision of the Supreme Court. If he regards the introduction into the RECORD of the Senate of extracts from that decision, and the statement of Mr. MacCracken—which happens to agree with it almost in haec verbae—as a reflection upon the Supreme Court and upon the Senate, he will have to have the entire benefit of it. All that can be deduced from such an insertion he may have, and make the most of it.

No one who heard my remarks will charge me with having said that the decision of the Supreme Court was erroneous, or with having made any reflection upon the judgment of the Supreme Court in the MacCracken case. My remarks could be interpreted, probably, as claiming that the judgment of the Senate was wrong, and also as claiming that the decision of the Supreme Court did not affirm, in any way or in any degree, the finding of guilty by the Senate. On the contrary, thereof, the Supreme Court passed by that question.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. There is an implication in that statement that the Court should have, or could have, passed upon the question of guilt or innocence of the respondent. Does the Senator maintain that to be so?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I was about to say that I would not set up my opinion against the opinion of the Supreme Court; but I will say that had I been on the bench

of the Supreme Court I certainly would have considered the question, and if I had found that the facts were as stated in the opinion of the Supreme Court that man would have been delivered free on the habeas corpus.

To go into this matter more particularly than I had any intention of doing, I call attention to what the Court itself noticed about that question. When I say the Court passed by the issue of guilt, my statement is founded upon what the Court itself says in the opinion. Hear this, a quotation from the opinion:

MacCracken contends that he is not punishable for contempt, because the obstruction, if any, which he caused to legislative processes, had been entirely removed and its evil effects undone before the contempt proceedings were instituted.

Was the question raised? Yes. Now, what did the Court say about it? Did they pass upon it? No; they passed it by, in the following language:

He points to the allegations in the petition for habeas corpus that he had surrendered all papers in his possession; that he was ready and willing to give any additional testimony which the committee might require; that he had secured the return of the papers taken from the files by Givven, with his permission; and that he was in no way responsible for the removal and destruction of the papers by Brittin. This contention goes to the question of guilt, not to that of the jurisdiction of the Senate.

Of course, it does; and that is the question this man was trying to raise there.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. I am sure the Senator must not have read the transcript showing from what the appeal was taken. I desire to call the Senator's attention to exactly how the appeal originated.

Before the Senate tried Mr. MacCracken a writ of habeas corpus was sued out. The evidence had not been heard, and no judgment of the Senate had been rendered. The court sustained a demurrer to the original petition for habeas corpus.

Then, after the Senate did try Mr. MacCracken and did convict him, the attorney for Mr. MacCracken chose to appeal, not from a proceeding in habeas corpus in which the evidence had been presented, but he chose to appeal from a decision on the original writ of habeas corpus. So that it was wholly and completely impossible on the appeal which Mr. MacCracken, through his attorney, filed for the evidence to be considered by the court.

I desire to make an additional statement. The Senator has read from the statement of the Court as to the evidence. That is really not the evidence which the Senate heard. That is the statement which was presented by Mr. MacCracken's writ of habeas corpus, to which the demurrer was sustained. Therefore, when the Senator reads from the statement of the Supreme Court as to the evidence, he is reading the evidence as quoted in the petition for habeas corpus, and it is not the evidence upon which Mr. MacCracken was convicted. So that I am sure the Senator will agree, when he looks into the record, that it was wholly and completely impossible for the Supreme Court on that appeal to have considered the evidence, but it could have done so if the appeal had not been taken from the ruling on the demurrer to the petition.

Mr. AUSTIN. Not at all, Mr. President; I do not assent to a word of that. I am surprised, indeed, to find as good a lawyer as the Senator from Alabama making such a claim here. Any lawyer who has had a practice in a common-law court knows that when the Government sees fit to demur to a petition for habeas corpus, it admits, and it must admit, all the facts that are properly pleaded therein. The United States appeared in the Supreme Court upon a demurrer by which it admitted those facts; otherwise the Supreme Court could not have accepted them, and written them down in this imperishable opinion here as they have done. I take them right on the same ground, and according to my recollection, those are the facts, indeed, from beginning to end. It happens, according to the records of the United States Senate, that they agree precisely with the records in all places where this issue has been up for trial.

Therefore, when the Supreme Court of the United States stated, from the point at which I was interrupted, the following, I say the Supreme Court passed over that question of guilt or innocence. Now let us have the rest of it.

This contention—

What contention? A contention raised by Mr. MacCracken in the Supreme Court of the United States.

This contention goes to the question of guilt, not to that of the jurisdiction of the Senate. The contempt with which MacCracken is charged is "the destruction and removal of certain papers." Whether he is guilty, and whether he has so far purged himself of contempt that he does not now deserve punishment, are the questions which the Senate proposes to try. The respondent to the petition did not, by demurring transfer to the Court the decision of these questions.

When, I ask, did that become the rule? I had no intention of raising that question in this body. It was raised by the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], and I feel forced to speak of them. The Supreme Court passed solely on the question of jurisdiction of the Senate.

The question was asked, What rights have been disregarded? What human rights have been overridden by this transaction, taken in its entirety, with all that it imports? I reply, rights so ancient, Mr. President, that no man knows when first they were put into writing. They go back down the ages even to a time before Runnymede and Magna Carta. They are the oaken beams that support the entire superstructure of the common law, which is the law of old England and the law of the American States, save in a few States; that law which was the expanding medium; that law which enabled the courts of England and the courts of America to adapt justice to the changing complexities of our civilization; that law which enabled the United States in particular to give vitality and life and practicality to the Constitution of the United States—the rights of property, of liberty, and of life.

A citizen of the United States for all time in the past, a citizen of England for at least 500 years, has possessed the inviolable right of having his confidences to his counsel protected in every court and jurisdiction in the land. Why? Because by experience it had been found, before that right was established, that without its protection injustice and tyranny could be wrought; because it was in conflict with the policy by which a man was presumed to be innocent until he was proven guilty; because it was consistent, and the only possible thing consistent, with the right of a man accused not to take the witness stand if he chose not to do so.

For centuries all tribunals have respected and safeguarded the right of the citizen to protection from seizure by violence and against his will of knowledge which is his, his private knowledge, and which remains his by virtue of this great fundamental right, although the knowledge is possessed by his counsel. So this is not the right of the counsel, and never has been the right of the counsel. The counsel never has any choice whether he will assert it or not. He is bound by law to assert it. He cannot refuse to assert it, and, no matter what subpoena comes down upon him, the lawyer, in obedience to the law, in obedience to the ethics of his profession, is bound to refuse to divulge the confidence of a client until that privilege which belongs not to him but to his client is waived by the client and permission of the client is granted.

Does that impede, in fact, does it hinder the administration of justice? Not at all. In this matter the Senate could and did subpoena the principals, the clients themselves, and when it had them there, also under a charge of contempt, did it find them guilty? Oh, no; Hanshue and Givvin were acquitted. But the man who had the honor and the honesty and the integrity, in law and morals, to stand up and face a committee of the United States Senate and say, "I am ready and willing to deliver every paper I have as soon as my clients waive their privilege, but I cannot do so until they do waive it"—he, among all these, must go to jail.

What happened to his partner, Lee, the only man who, according to the evidence, turned over papers which were destroyed? His name was stricken out of the resolution of complaint on the floor of the Senate. Many of us on this side of the Chamber, at the time we voted for that resolution,

supposed his name was in it; but he goes scot free, although he is the only person through whose means and knowledge a client possessed himself of his papers and ripped them up. It was always a matter of remarkable peculiarity to me that nothing was done with that man. He had been a legislative clerk. The papers with which he was connected did not relate to the previous administration, but related to the Democratic administration and to then incumbents of the Post Office Department; and it has always seemed to me remarkable that the Senate's action should have resulted in nothing being done with Mr. Lee, but Mr. MacCracken should go to jail.

So, Mr. President, when I am asked what rights have been overridden, I say the client's rights to confidence, to safety of his property, of his person, of his liberty, of his life, to say nothing about the rights of the attorney himself, who becomes the martyr in the cause.

WORK-RELIEF PROGRAM

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, I have another very brief statement with respect to the McCarran amendment, which it will take me only a few moments to submit.

On Wednesday the newspapers carried the report that, if the work-relief bill shall be passed, Mr. Fechner hopes to bring the enlistment in the C. C. C. up to 640,000, at a cost of slightly more than \$1,000 a man, making his budget reach a grand total of \$660,000,000. It is estimated that 33,555 civilians will be put to work, at from \$100 to \$200 a month. It will thus be seen that in the \$5,000,000,000 appropriation bill it is proposed to add great numbers to the C. C. C. at an annual cost of something like \$1,030 per person, while the President insists that the three and one-half million people on the relief rolls shall be put to work on an average of \$600 per year, or \$50 per month.

But let us pass that by for the present and turn again to the McCarran amendment and to the statement made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] that, if the McCarran amendment were made a part of the bill, the cost would be approximately \$2,340,000,000 more.

Under the President's program it is supposed that \$2,100,000,000 will be spent for labor, or 52½ percent, and \$1,900,000,000 for materials, or 47½ percent. The figures of the Senator from Arkansas are arrived at by placing the labor cost at 70 percent and the material cost at 30 percent.

I call attention, however, to the purpose of the public-works program, namely, to furnish labor for three and one-half million people now on the relief rolls. Certainly, from the President's positive statement in his annual address, we get the distinct impression that this is the chief object, and that the effort to improve industry by furnishing materials is a mere incident to the program.

I desire, however, to emphasize the fact that, if the President will operate under the McCarran amendment and stagger the employment so that it will average only \$50 per month, it will take an appropriation of only \$3,000,000,000 to accomplish his purpose. In other words, 70 percent of \$3,000,000,000 gives to labor the \$2,100,000,000 which the President would give it under his program. Therefore, instead of its being necessary to increase the appropriation by \$2,340,000,000, we can, as a matter of fact, reduce it by a billion dollars and accomplish what the President wishes to accomplish; or, putting it in another way, instead of taking care of 3,500,000 persons, we can appropriate \$4,000,000,000 and take care of 4,666,666 persons.

I know that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] looks with some disgust at these figures, but I challenge him to correct them if he can.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BYRNES. I was not looking with disgust. I had come to the conclusion that the Senator from Delaware was a greater mathematician than is Dr. Townsend.

Mr. HASTINGS. That is exactly what I thought the Senator had in his mind.

Of course, if the purpose of the public-works program is to boost the industries which will furnish the material, this argument is not applicable. Neither is it applicable if we admit that we are willing to increase the "wealth of the Nation" by building public projects at the least cost by forcing men now unemployed to work for any wage the Government may fix. It has, of course, been pointed out many times by many Senators that the employment of a man for 2 or 3 days a week at full wage does not destroy the incentive to get a full-time job with full wage with industry.

It was contended before the committee by Mr. Gill, Mr. Hopkins' assistant, that upon the completion of this relief program the assets of the Federal Government would be less by a billion dollars if we should adopt the McCarran amendment. I am wondering, however, what the thinking members of the chamber of commerce, which association has but recently condemned the McCarran amendment, would say if we should propound these inquiries:

Shall we borrow and appropriate \$3,000,000,000, pay the prevailing wage, and increase the wealth of the Nation \$3,000,000,000 by building various forms of public projects? or

Shall we increase the amount that we borrow and appropriate by \$1,000,000,000—that is, from three billion to four billion—with the hope and expectation that by so doing we can increase the total wealth of the Nation by more than \$4,000,000,000 by compelling labor to accept whatever wage the Federal Government chooses to pay?

In other words, shall we put the additional strain of a billion dollars upon the Federal Treasury merely because we have the opportunity to exploit the labor of men on the relief rolls, and thereby increase the wealth of the Nation to the extent of that exploitation by building projects which we do not now need, and which, in most instances, can be of service to the country only in generations to come?

Should we not be doing a better service by keeping the appropriations down to the minimum and leaving some of these public-works projects for the future?

The mere fact that the American Federation of Labor is back of this amendment is no good reason why the chamber of commerce should be opposed to it.

The more we think about the condition of the Treasury, and the less we think about the fear that we may be charged with being controlled by labor, the sooner we will meet this question and pass upon its merits.

Mr. President, if anyone can point out any mistakes in these figures I should like to have it done. It is undoubtedly true, according to the testimony before the committee, assuming that testimony to be accurate, that if we pay the prevailing wage we shift the payment to labor from 52½ percent to 70 percent; and it is as clear as it can be that if we appropriate only \$3,000,000,000, and take 70 percent of it for labor, we will have accomplished exactly what the President proposed to accomplish when he asked for \$4,000,000,000 for the same purpose.

I should like to know why we are not on the safe course if we take the lower amount, \$3,000,000,000, and apply the McCarran amendment to it, taking care of three and a half million men, and not undertake to increase the wealth of the Nation at the expense of the people on the relief rolls.

ADMINISTRATION OF CODES UNDER THE N. R. A.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask what is before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The business before the Senate is Senate Resolution 79.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 79) submitted by Mr. NYE and Mr. McCARRAN on the 14th instant, and reported from the Committee on Finance and the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I should like to address myself briefly to the pending resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, in line 2, after the words "Senate Committee on", it is proposed to strike out the word "Commerce" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "Finance."

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, there are two resolutions pending before the Senate which really have the same objective; that is, to inquire into the effect of the N. R. A. upon small business, and as to its fostering monopoly or monopolistic practices.

I myself have no desire to encourage two investigations. I see no justification for two investigations running along practically the same lines. I happen to be a member of the subcommittee of one of the contemplated investigating committees; but I am quite willing to forego the labor connected with that committee, or the honor which may be attached to it, if we can accomplish what we all undoubtedly desire to accomplish, which is to obtain the actual facts. We should have a thorough investigation. If we have such an investigation, it will be most informative.

I wish only to say that I sincerely hope the Finance Committee will give sufficient weight to the importance of inquiring into the question of monopoly and the monopolistic effect of some of the N. R. A. codes. In my opinion, they have had a much greater effect in that direction than was anticipated by some, although some of us did anticipate such a result from the beginning. At least 137 of these codes which I have examined seem to me to be distinctly combinations or conspiracies in restraint of trade, combinations for the fostering of monopoly, for the fixing of exorbitant and unjust prices. They have resulted in price fixing and in establishing a price list which is one of the forces retarding recovery in this country. They are extorting unconscionable prices from the people, and they stand in the way of recovery.

Unless we shall have a thorough investigation of that question we will enter upon the consideration of the N. R. A. bill without the information which it is necessary to have in order to formulate a measure which will protect the interests of the people of the United States.

So I say that, while I myself have no desire to urge two investigations, I do urge the Finance Committee to make a thorough investigation of the monopolistic trend which prevails at this time.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Idaho that that was the desire of the Finance Committee, as evidenced when we had a very well-attended meeting on yesterday; and if the resolution shall direct the Finance Committee to make the investigation we will employ every effort to make an aggressive and thorough investigation in order to ascertain the facts.

Mr. BORAH. It should be remembered also, Mr. President, that the President in his message spoke specifically against monopoly and monopolistic practices and expressed the desire to have enacted a measure which would prevent them.

Mr. HARRISON. I may say further to the Senator that it is the hope of the committee, if this resolution shall be adopted, that we may have the full cooperation of the distinguished Senator from Idaho and other members of the Judiciary Committee, and also of the authors of the resolution, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Nye] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCarran].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment to the resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment to the resolution will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 1, after the word "and", to strike out "to make such expenditures" and to insert "to employ such clerical assistants"; and in line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$5,000", so as to make the clause read:

For the purposes of this resolution the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions and recesses of the Congress until the final report is submitted, to require by subpoena

or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to employ such clerical assistants as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas desire that any disposition shall be made of the other resolution, being Senate Resolution 35?

Mr. ROBINSON. I think not, at this time.

WORK-RELIEF PROGRAM

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only briefly, and am only moved to speak at all by reason of certain observations submitted a few moments ago by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Hastings]. In his presentation he referred to a calculation which he had made and which appeared to show that the so-called "McCarran amendment", with its prevailing-wage provision, need not of necessity add to the expense of administering House Joint Resolution No. 117. He made the point, as I understood his remarks, that the increased wages on the prevailing-wage basis could be had by the mere expedient of decreasing the number of days, leaving the total wage on the basis contemplated by the President but cutting down the amount of public works attained and therefore the amount of materials necessary for public works, and, of course, reducing the amount expended for such materials. According to his calculation, instead of an increased cost from the McCarran amendment, there would be an actual saving to the Treasury, and the total cost of the work-relief projects would be a little over \$3,000,000,000 instead of \$4,000,000,000 calculated as necessary in carrying out the projects under the theory of the security wage.

I rise, Mr. President, first to express my concurrence in the calculation made by the Senator from Delaware, and, second, to do a thing which I think may be of service to some Senators, namely, to call attention to the fact that in the hearings there is a memorandum which was prepared in the office of the Administrator of the Emergency Relief organization which was presented to the Committee on Appropriations by Mr. Gill, the Assistant Administrator. In this memorandum, prepared on behalf of the administrative agency, we find substantial support for the comment which the Senator from Delaware made. I read briefly from the statement submitted in the memorandum by Mr. Gill, as follows:

Assuming the 3,500,000 persons would be paid at the local prevailing wage rate (80 cents an hour average), but that they would work only enough hours to provide them with a monthly earning of \$50 (average), the wage bill would total \$175,000,000 a month.

I interrupt the reading at this point to say that, on the calculation which has been made for the payment of an average security wage of \$50 a month, the monthly wage payment was taken at exactly the same figure, namely, \$175,000,000.

I now proceed to the reading:

Inasmuch as the hours of work would be decreased to 62½ hours a month (\$50 a month average wage payment divided by 80 cents an hour average prevailing wage rate), the amount of work performed, assuming the same efficiency, would be cut in half and therefore the cost of materials would be reduced from \$160,000,000 to \$80,000,000 a month, making a total cost of \$255,000,000 a month, or \$3,060,000,000 a year. Thus for \$3,060,000,000 the Government would receive but 50 percent of the benefit that it would receive from the \$4,000,000,000 program, and with the inevitable loss of efficiency, working men half time, it is safe to say that this loss would be considerably in excess of 50 percent.

This statement, Mr. President, makes but little comment necessary. It is obvious upon its face that the accredited officer of the Relief Administration, who was presenting the administration's viewpoint with respect to this particular amendment and the subject which is referred to in House Joint Resolution 117, concedes that there is a way by the mere cutting down of the number of hours and the amount

to be accomplished by which the labor bill may be maintained at exactly the same figure contemplated in the President's program, and that, if resort is had to the decreased hours and fewer projects, the material bill will be smaller, and that the total program, instead of costing \$4,000,000,000 per year, will cost but little over \$3,000,000,000 per year.

I insist that Senators who are sincerely interested in this subject should pay heed to the contention made by Mr. Gill in this memorandum, because, instead of it being justification for the claim that it would cost \$2,000,000,000 more, it clearly demonstrates that the program would cost \$1,000,000,000 less.

Therefore, when from various quarters we hear it iterated and reiterated that the McCarran amendment will bring an undue cost to the Treasury, we are justified in calling attention as emphatically as we can to the fact that that statement is based upon a false assumption as to what may be done; it is in violation of the theory contained in Mr. Gill's memoranda; it is an inaccurate statement; it misleads the country into the belief that something which may cost \$1,000,000,000 less will, in fact, cost \$2,000,000,000 more.

There is no justification for the claim that the McCarran amendment will cost the Treasury more money unless insistence shall be made upon a monthly working average of 130 hours. If, of course, the hours are held up to that level, and wages are increased, the total cost will be augmented, but if the hours are cut down, as the wage increase goes up, then, the labor bill, in its total amount, will be identically the same as was contemplated by the President; and there is not any reason at all for anybody to impute to the President a resolute and indefensible desire to increase the cost of this program \$2,000,000,000 above his first estimate.

I may add that the prepared memorandum which was used as the basis for argument against the McCarran amendment, when it is reduced to its final analysis contains just one definite suggestion—not that the cost would be increased, but that the amount of public works secured by the prevailing-wage program would be less and of less value to the Government than the works which would be obtained if we pay the security, or starvation wage. So the question is not one of cost. The question is, are we to permit our Government to take advantage of the distressed labor market to obtain the services of labor at less than the value of that labor in order that the Government may obtain more for its money? And related to that question is the other, whether it is justifiable to risk tearing down the wage structure in order to drive a hard bargain with labor and thus profit from the helpless and destitute poor.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I wish to add only a word with reference to the arguments of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. STEIWER]. The figures to which the Senator referred coming from Mr. Gill, of the Emergency Administration, simply showed that if the hours were reduced from 130 to 62½, less material would be used in one-half the time and, consequently, less money would be spent. It follows that if we should reduce the number to 30 hours per week and pay the same wage, the employees working only 30 hours, still less material would be used and less money spent. If we should give them the money and should not ask them to work at all, there would be still further reduction, because no money would be needed at all for the purchase of material.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. I should like to inquire of the Senator from South Carolina whether my assumption is correct that the purpose of the appropriation is to take care of the unemployed? Does the Senator from South Carolina understand that to be its purpose?

Mr. BYRNES. Undoubtedly the Senator from Delaware has been absent from the Chamber, because the subject has been discussed within the last few days. The purpose of the joint resolution is to give jobs to three and one-half million people who are now on the relief rolls receiving a dole, and to give them a chance to render service for what they

receive from the Government instead of receiving grocery orders.

When the Senator from Delaware joined the Senator from Oregon, who has just concluded his statement, in which he referred to the security wage as a starvation wage, he overlooked the fact that the people in whose interest this program is proposed are today receiving a pittance, and that they are hunting jobs and an opportunity for work instead of receiving grocery orders. The program was intended to give them a chance to work instead of continuing as beneficiaries of the dole. The Senator from Delaware prefers the dole. The people of America do not prefer a continuance of the dole.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the Senator answer another question? If it be true, as he says it is, that it is for the purpose of taking care of three and one-half million people, and if it be true, as we contend, that if we adopt the McCarran amendment we can take care of them just as well with \$3,000,000,000, is there any reason why we should not do that, instead of straining the credit of the Government to the extent of another billion dollars?

Mr. BYRNES. If it is a question of straining the credit of the Government, we can do it by simply appropriating \$1,000,000,000 to continue the dole system. This program is to enter upon public works solely as an opportunity to give jobs to people now upon the relief roll. The Senator from Delaware is opposed to it. The Senator from Delaware wants to continue the dole system, does he not?

Mr. HASTINGS. Oh, no!

Mr. BYRNES. Is the Senator from Delaware in favor of continuing the dole system or in favor of giving these people work?

Mr. HASTINGS. If the Senator will be good enough to answer my question, I want to know if it be true that the purpose is to take care of the unemployed and give them what the President says they would get under his plan, namely, \$2,100,000,000; and if we accept the McCarran amendment, would not labor get just as much that way with \$3,000,000,000 as the other way with \$4,000,000,000?

Mr. BYRNES. If we should give \$4,000,000,000 to men working 62½ hours a month, we would spend just as much money as if we should pay \$4,000,000,000 to men working 130 hours a month. Even the Senator from Delaware, great mathematician as he is, should recognize that. I say that if we should reduce the working hours to 30 and still give \$4,000,000,000 it would cost just the same amount, but we would not provide much work. The object of this program, as the President of the United States said to the Congress, is to give to these people jobs upon useful projects and to make them feel that they are earning something instead of continuing as beneficiaries of a dole system.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, is it not of great importance to keep in mind that the materials which would be bought will keep those in private industry employed, and if we use twice as many materials, we keep busy twice as many men who are normally employed? The Senator from Delaware ignores that consideration entirely.

Mr. BYRNES. In answer to the Senator from Texas let me say that I did not intend to make a statement on the subject at this time, but if there is anything that is apparent it is the correctness of the statement of the Senator from Texas. When orders are given for material, industry immediately receives a stimulus. As industry is stimulated the officials in charge of industry must seek employees. When they seek employees, three and one-half million men who are now hunting jobs will be removed from the labor market, and when the labor market is depleted by three and one-half million, the result will be an increase in the opportunity for labor. The Senator from Texas is correct in his statement, for it follows that as the result of orders for materials the workingmen of the United States now employed and men who are unemployed will receive employment in private industry; but as long as three and one-half million men without jobs are knocking at the door seeking jobs, men who are in jobs and those who are unemployed and upon the relief roll cannot hope for any improvement in their condition.

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, I merely want to submit two observations, and then I shall conclude so far as today's discussion may be concerned.

The first is that this is not a matter of choice between the dole and work relief, because the record discloses that of the three and one-half million concerning whom we are all very much interested, 2,225,000 are now on work relief, and most of them are receiving the prevailing rate of wages. That testimony is in the Record.

In my own State there are counties in which, of the entire relief roll, 96 percent are cared for by work relief rather than by dole. I have no doubt that in many places in the United States the percentage is as favorable as that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. STEIWER. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. How long does the Senator believe that program can continue if the pending joint resolution is killed or left in the committee?

Mr. STEIWER. It cannot continue without appropriation, of course, but it can continue on the present basis of cost, which is now running about \$150,000,000 per month.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the Senator be generous enough to tell us what these men are earning per month on the average among those who are now on work relief?

Mr. STEIWER. I speak only from memory, but I took the trouble to wire some of the county administrators and I find that for common labor they are paying an average of 50 cents per hour and for skilled labor they are paying an average of 90 cents per hour.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that that does not in any way show what their average earning is.

Mr. STEIWER. I appreciate that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask the Senator further—

Mr. STEIWER. Let me answer the Senator's question. The Senator intrudes so rapidly that I cannot finish the answer I was making.

The evidence discloses, moreover, from the same source of information, that the rural average per week or per month is lower than that in the towns; that in some parts of the county the average earnings of farmers who were working on relief at odd times was as low as \$19 per month. The all-over average in the county was approximately \$25 per month, but the requirement for labor in most cases did not exceed 3 days per week, and in no case did it exceed 4 days per week; and, according to the information which I have, very many of these people had some other sources of revenue with which they maintained themselves.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Now will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. STEIWER. Certainly.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is the Senator referring to that program in approval or disapproval?

Mr. STEIWER. Not in entire approval, Mr. President.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What is the point of the Senator's argument?

Mr. STEIWER. I have said that the destitute are not all on dole. I am referring to it to distinguish that kind of work relief from what is intended when Senators speak so contemptuously of the dole system, and to say to the Senate and to the Senator from Alabama that in those counties where the money is not wasted our people are not as badly situated as some of us have been led to believe, and the counties in which there is a desperate and deplorable condition in the main will be found to be counties in which there is a tremendous waste of the public money.

I did not rise to discuss that subject, however, at this moment. I shall do so at some future time. I found, from information from a number of these counties, that waste was rampant and inexcusable and that the people on relief were suffering by reason of the failure to utilize the money wisely.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator in his argument referred to the prevailing conditions where work relief is now being given; and, as I recall Mr. Hopkins' testimony, he said the average earnings were \$25 a month. I had understood that the Senator's statement was in approval of that and in opposition to the President's program, and that he was illustrating what was now being done in opposition to the security-wage program.

Mr. STEIWER. Nothing that I said indicated that I approved the kind of situation which I have described. I merely wanted to point out, as the Senator, I think, now knows, that it is not true, it is not accurate, to say that all this great body of unfortunate people are on dole.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have made no such statement.

Mr. STEIWER. Others make the statement; possibly I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator certainly did. Let me call his attention to Mr. Gill's testimony on page 9 of the supplemental hearings before the Senate committee, where he uses the expression:

With the average payment to each worker amounting to only \$25 a month.

I desire to ask the Senator if he is satisfied with that?

Mr. STEIWER. Oh, no! I am a supporter of the prevailing rate of wage.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Or if he is in favor of the program which contemplates at least doubling that wage on the security-wage program?

Mr. STEIWER. If resort is had to work relief, I favor doubling the amount but would not force a security wage on any laborer. Let me see if I cannot calm the Senator's fears just a little by calling attention to the map at page 5, also a part of the record in this matter. I do so in order to call attention to the average hourly wage in the State of Alabama, shown on the map to be between 10 and 19 cents per hour, and the average of other parts of the country. In my own State it is 50 cents an hour and up. The \$25-per-month average that Mr. Hopkins is talking about is occasioned almost entirely by the low wage in those parts of the country, like Alabama, where they pay only between 10 and 20 cents per hour on the average for common labor; and there would be no such average figure as \$25 if those parts of the country were excluded from the calculation.

Mr. President, I desire to make one other observation, not in answer to my friend from Alabama, but in answer to the proposal suggested here a minute ago by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. He made the argument in effect that although the wage total could be kept the same on a prevailing wage as it could upon a security wage without any additional cost to the country, there would be a loss in that there would not be so much work done, and therefore there would not be so great a market for the materials.

That, I think, is a fair argument, or would be a fair argument, except that it comes with but little force at this day and time, when we are advised that our Government has just concluded a tariff-bargaining treaty with Belgium lowering the protective tariff on cement and other building materials, because it means, in plain words, that the acquisition of materials under this joint resolution will not be a program for the distressed material man of America, but will be in part an effort to bring about a great cooperative, benevolent system of commerce with the world, and that the Belgians and other foreign producers will in part enjoy the benefits of the fourth and unnecessary billion dollars to be expended from the money appropriated by this resolution.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBINSON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the

United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. HARRISON, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the nominations of Oscar Mikkelsen and Mark E. Bowers, assistant dental surgeons, to be passed assistant dental surgeons in the Public Health Service, to rank as such from February 5, 1935.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

NELLIE DOUGHERTY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire the attention of the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE].

The Post Office Department has taken up with me the case of Nellie Dougherty, nominated to be postmaster at Minot, N. Dak., in place of B. E. Stewart, whose commission expired in March 1931. It appears that objection was made by the two Senators from North Dakota because of Mrs. Dougherty being a Democratic national committeewoman. She is not any longer a committeewoman, and I desire to know if the Senator from North Dakota has any objection to the nomination.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I have signified during the day my intention of waiving any objection which has been mine; but I hope the Senator has consulted my colleague [Mr. FRAZIER].

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not done so. He is a member of the committee. May I have this nomination put on the calendar?

Mr. NYE. I have no objection to its being put on the calendar.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will report it, and let it go to the calendar, and confer with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and placed on the calendar. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the first nomination in order.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard P. Williams to be brigadier general in the Marine Corps.

Mr. KING. Let that nomination go over.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, the nomination of Richard P. Williams to be brigadier general in the Marine Corps has been pending in the Senate since February 6. The nomination of Gen. John H. Russell for promotion has been pending since February 18. The consideration of these nominations has been delayed more or less at the request of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK], who brought to the attention of the Senate committee some alleged information into which we made inquiry; and after doing so, the committee were impressed that these nominations should be favorably reported and confirmed by the Senate.

The printed testimony was not delivered to the Senate until today. It was ordered some days ago, but was delayed somewhat; and in discussing the matter with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] I find that he does not desire to have the nominations considered today, as I understand. Is that the desire of the Senator?

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, from what other Senators have said to me, I am sure it would be exceedingly difficult to finish the consideration of the nominations today if we should begin them today, and I know there are other Senators who desire that they go over. I may state that the evidence taken before the committee was distributed only today, and it is not all the evidence we should have liked to present before the committee. I think the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] probably was interested and would be interested in having more evidence given before the committee. I certainly should not be ready to take up the nominations

today; and I should particularly like to have the committee summon the two officers whose names I gave, who stated that General Russell was using property the use of which was prohibited by law.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, that particular question came to the attention of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the committee did make inquiry. However, they did not subpoena the particular witnesses to whom reference is made, but made inquiry through the Department, and the committee was furnished information from the official records to the effect that the property in question, which was held at first at the Marine Barracks and later at the headquarters of General Russell, was obtained some 30 or 60 days prior to the enactment of a law providing that funds should not be used out of the particular appropriation in question for the purchase of articles of that character. That, I think, is the undisputed record. So the committee did not feel that it was necessary to subpoena officers from Quantico to testify to that point.

I did not understand that the officers said that the property was being purchased in violation of law, but some person who wrote to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] made the statement, and the statement was made on the premise that the law had been enacted prior to the time the property had been acquired. The law was enacted some 60 days afterwards. So the committee was impressed with the fact that there was no guilt whatever on the part of General Russell in that particular.

I do not know how the officers could furnish any different evidence. The evidence I refer to is the evidence of the record which we thought was the best evidence on that particular point.

Mr. BLACK. Did not that record come from General Russell?

Mr. TRAMMELL. It came from the Department here.

Mr. BLACK. May I ask if the matter was not referred to Assistant Secretary Roosevelt, and if he did not refer it to General Russell for answer, and if General Russell did not answer, and if that is not the only answer that has been sent?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I think that is correct; but he answered from the records as to the facts. Of course, I and other members of the committee have desired to be very fair and courteous in carrying on the investigation, but almost invariably the insinuations and the rumors against General Russell, and also General Williams, upon inquiry have developed into merely suspicions or rumors, with no facts to sustain them. I never heard of quite so many rumors and suspicions being circulated against a person, which, when we go into the facts, we find vanish into thin air, for there are really no facts to support the contentions. The committee has endeavored to investigate all these things.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I sought on two occasions to have consideration of these nominations, but it does not appear that we can secure their consideration this afternoon, so I was just about to suggest that we have an agreement to take them up Monday afternoon.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I had in mind to suggest that we set an hour, say Monday or Tuesday at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, if we can so arrange, to take up the nominations and dispose of them one way or the other.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I desire to say, with reference to the statement that rumors have been traced down, that I intend to move to recommit these nominations, and I can give the committee a list of many witnesses from the Marine Corps from whom they can obtain the facts as to these promotions.

I desire to say in connection with the statement made that there has been sworn evidence before the committee that at one time General Russell was engaged in the command of troops, and that he surrendered or was about to surrender his battalion to one Mexican with a white flag. That evidence has been sworn to before the committee. I had understood, until I read the letter from General Lejeune,

who, it has been testified, was present on that occasion, that he had denied it. I have read his letter carefully, and he does not deny it. I wrote him a letter 4 days ago and asked him the question again. I received a reply from him, and he neither denied the statement nor affirmed it.

I have taken the matter up with the Navy Department in order to find out about the alleged battle of "Russell's Run." Marine Corps headquarters told me they did not have the facts and that I should take it up with the War Department. I took it up with the War Department, and I cannot get a statement there.

I think that before we consider these nominations, with the sworn evidence so contradictory as between two witnesses, General Russell and the other man, there ought to be some investigation. I am not making complaint about the committee; I want that understood. But I do think that before we take up the question, whether it is Monday or Tuesday, there ought to be some way of ascertaining just exactly what did happen at El Tejar, Mexico.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, is it possible that the battle was so unimportant that only two people can testify about it?

Mr. BLACK. General Russell, as I recall, testified that there were between five and six hundred Mexicans there. General Butler testified there was one Mexican. I took the position that if there had been between five and six hundred Mexicans there would be something about it in the Department. I have had all the records traced, and I have gone to every place I could think of, and I cannot find a single trace of this incident, when an entire battalion was brought up to aid General Russell.

Mr. BARKLEY. In what war was this?

Mr. BLACK. This was the war of Veracruz.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, this involves a question of some evidence on a matter which I do not think is of any very great consequence. General Butler did come before the committee and complain, and among the things he mentioned was the battle of—

Mr. BLACK. The battle of "Russell's Run." [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBINSON. Which way did he run?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Of course, General Russell says that there were a large number of troops there, and the evidence will show for itself on that point. The facts are controverted. General Butler, when asked about General Lejeune, said that he was one of the two outstanding soldiers in America. He placed only one other in the class with General Lejeune, who has written a letter here voluntarily commending General Russell, commending him upon his service in Haiti when he was there. He has the endorsement, I would say the absolute endorsement, of General Lejeune, as to his service in the Marine Corps.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. It was during General Russell's service in Haiti that he arrogated to himself the right to arrest a United States Senator going to Haiti, was it not?

Mr. TRAMMELL. That is water that has passed the mill. That matter was before us when we considered General Russell's nomination, when the President sent the nomination in a year and a half ago. Of course, there are two sides to that question. I do not want to take the time now, unless we are going to consider the matter this afternoon, to discuss that phase of it.

As a matter of fact, General Russell says he was not the instigator of the move to keep the Senator out, but that he advised with others with whom he was consulting, and that he found it would be proper to let him come in, but the matter was taken up with the State Department, and the State Department directed him to follow out the orders issued by the Governor of Haiti, and that he was only acting under orders. So that is that.

I think that if we are to have the matter taken up next week there is no use going into a discussion of all the details this afternoon.

Mr. BLACK. Before we make an agreement—

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, let us be clear as to whether we are to proceed with this matter this afternoon

or whether we are to proceed with it on some other occasion. I suggest, with all due deference to the Senators—and I have no desire, of course, to determine any discussion between them—that if we are not to take this matter up this afternoon, let us ascertain that fact. If we are to take it up at a definite date, let us fix the date, and let us go about all these things in an orderly way.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I should like to have a date set for the consideration of the nominations.

Mr. BLACK. Before entering into an agreement I wish to say a few words with reference to what the Senator from Florida has stated.

There is evidence under oath from General Butler that he ran for miles with a battalion to rescue General Russell when General Russell was supposed to be under attack by Mexicans; that when he arrived he found no Mexicans, except that one man had come out from the woods with a white flag and gone to General Russell and told him that he had him surrounded with troops and intended to capture him; that General Russell then called by radio for reinforcements and a battalion rushed up, after running for miles, to rescue General Russell. That is under oath. General Russell denies the statement. He says there were five or six hundred Mexicans. I say that before the Senate is called on to vote upon this matter the committee ought to find out from some source whether there were five or six hundred Mexicans or whether there were none.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLACK. I have not the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON. I move that the Senate proceed to consider these nominations. If we are to have the debate upon them at the present time let us proceed with them and dispose of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield for the purpose of permitting the Senator from California to make the motion he has proposed?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, that is agreeable to me, although under the circumstances I had thought that probably we would save time by setting an hour, either Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing, if the Senator will pardon me, to fix a time that is convenient to everybody for the presentation of the matters hereafter, but I am not willing to sit here and listen to a discussion upon a matter, which, to my mind, whether to anybody else's or not, was adequately explained before the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is prepared to entertain a motion by the Senator from Florida, or to entertain a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I move that on Monday next at 3 o'clock the Senate proceed to consider the two nominations in question.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, before the question is put, I desire to make a request. In view of the fact that General Russell has made one statement and General Butler another—and I venture the assertion that if the statement of General Butler were proved to be true there would not be 10 votes in the Senate for General Russell—I think we have a right to request that efforts be made to ascertain which statement is correct. I have exhausted every resource I have in trying to find out where the records are. I wrote General Lejeune, and I have written him since the other letter was written, but he has not replied to my statement about this matter. I have no objection to taking the nominations up on Monday. I intend to make a motion to recommit all these nominations at the time they come up.

Mr. President, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry. As I understand, even though a motion to consider these nominations on Monday should be adopted, we would still have the right to move to recommit the nominations?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no question about that.

Mr. BLACK. I shall not object to the motion, Mr. President; but I do desire to request that in the meantime the

committee endeavor to ascertain whether or not there is any record of this incident at El Tejar, in order that it may be presented on that occasion.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion before the Senate is that further consideration of these nominations be postponed until 3 o'clock on Monday.

MR. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I understand the motion to be that at 3 o'clock on Monday the Senate proceed with the nominations.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is informed by the clerk that such action would have to be agreed to by unanimous consent, but that a motion to postpone the present deliberations would be in order.

MR. McNARY. Mr. President, it is the privilege of any Senator to move the adoption of a special order for a definite time. I understood the motion to be that on Monday at 3 o'clock the Senate proceed with the consideration of these nominations in executive session.

MR. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, what I had in contemplation was that a special order should be adopted that at 3 o'clock on Monday next the Senate should proceed to the consideration of these nominations.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion requires a two-thirds vote to be adopted. [Putting the question.] The motion appears to be unanimously agreed to.

IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

MR. BLACK. I ask that those nominations go over also.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations in the Navy will go over until Monday at 3 o'clock, at the request of the Senator from Alabama.

MR. BLACK. I think it would be proper to take up all of them together.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

MR. BLACK. Mr. President, I ask that those nominations also go over in the same manner as the other nominations.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. At the request of the Senator from Alabama the nominations in the Marine Corps are also postponed until Monday at 3 o'clock.

The Senate resumed legislative session.

DESCENT AND DISTRIBUTION IN THE DISTRICT

MR. KING. Mr. President, I call attention to Senate bill 409, which was passed by the Senate on Monday last. On the same day a similar measure—indeed, one identical in terms—passed the House of Representatives, and has been messaged to the Senate. I ask that the House measure be now laid before the Senate.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 3464) to amend certain sections of the code of law for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901, as amended, relating to descent and distribution, which was read twice by its title.

MR. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the bill the title of which has just been read.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 380 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code, title 29, sec. 288), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 380. If there be no child, or descendant, the whole shall go to the father and mother in equal shares or to the survivor of them."

SEC. 2. Section 384 of such act, as amended (D. C. Code, title 29, sec. 292), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 384. If there be no collaterals, the grandfathers and grandmothers, or such of them as survive, shall take alike."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 940 of such act, as amended (D. C. Code, title 25, sec. 231), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 940. Course of descendants generally: On the death of any person seized of an estate in fee simple in lands, tenements, or hereditaments in the District of Columbia, and intestate thereof,

the same shall descend in fee simple to such person's kindred in the following order, namely:

"First. To his child or children and their descendants, if any, equally.

"Second. If there be no child or descendant of a child, then equally to the father and mother of the intestate, or the whole to the sole surviving parent.

"Third. If there be no father or mother, then to the brothers and sisters of the intestate, and their descendants equally.

"Fourth. If there be no brother or sister, or descendant from a brother or sister, then the whole shall go to the widow or widower of the intestate.

"Fifth. If none such, then one moiety of the estate shall go to the paternal, the other to the maternal kindred of the intestate in the following order:

"Sixth. First to the grandfather and grandmother equally, but if one be dead the entire moiety to the sole surviving grandparent.

"Seventh. If none, then to the uncles and aunts of the intestate, and their descendants equally.

"Eighth. If none such, then to the great-grandfathers and great-grandmothers, in the same manner prescribed for grandfather and grandmother in subdivision 6.

"Ninth. If none, then to the brothers and sisters of the grandfathers and grandmothers, and their descendants equally.

"Tenth. And so on in other cases, without end, passing to the nearest lineal ancestors and the descendants of such ancestors.

"Eleventh. If there be no paternal kindred, the whole shall go to the maternal kindred; and if there be no maternal kindred, the whole shall go to the paternal kindred. If there be neither maternal or paternal kindred, the whole shall go to the kindred of the husband or wife of the intestate in the like course as if such husband or wife had died entitled to the estate; and if the intestate has had more husbands or wives than one, and all have died before such intestate, then the estate shall be equally divided among the kindred of the several husbands or wives in equal degree equally."

(B) Sections 941 to 951, inclusive, of such act, as amended (D. C. Code, title 25, secs. 232 to 242, inclusive), are hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. Section 954 of such act, as amended (D. C. Code, title 25, sec. 245), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 954. In no case shall there be any distinction between the kindred of the whole- and the half-blood."

SEC. 5. Section 955 of such act, as amended (D. C. Code, title 25, sec. 246), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 955. Whenever those entitled to share in the estate in fee simple in lands, tenements, or hereditaments in the District of Columbia, of an intestate, are all in the same degree of kindred to the intestate, they shall take per capita or by persons; and, where a part of them are dead and a part living, the issue of those dead shall take per stirpes or by stocks the shares of their deceased parents."

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

MR. ROBINSON. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock meridian.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 4, 1935, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 28, 1935

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

John J. Muccio, of Rhode Island, now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a consul, to be also a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

William P. Cochran, Jr., of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer, unclassified, and a vice consul of career, to be also a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Robert E. Bowdon, Jr., to be postmaster at Calera, Ala., in place of E. K. Wood, removed.

Clarence C. Calhoun to be postmaster at Jackson, Ala., in place of Joseph Loran. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1934.

Henry G. Sockwell to be postmaster at Tusculum, Ala., in place of J. S. Henderson. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1933.

Edgar A. Tatum to be postmaster at Valley Head, Ala., in place of P. M. Ellis. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1934.

Alma Cardwell to be postmaster at Vredenburgh, Ala., in place of Emma Rippetoe, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Olice F. Huson to be postmaster at Heber Springs, Ark., in place of Ida Burns. Incumbent's commission expired May 2, 1934.

CALIFORNIA

Clayborne L. Boren to be postmaster at Bell, Calif., in place of C. C. McGonegal. Incumbent's commission expired May 7, 1934.

Gay E. Shamel to be postmaster at Cambria, Calif., in place of Earl Van Gorden. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Walter A. Oxford to be postmaster at Orosi, Calif., in place of D. I. Roth. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Wilkin B. Sheldon to be postmaster at San Martin, Calif., in place of J. C. Gallant, removed.

George H. Gischel to be postmaster at Tracy, Calif., in place of G. H. Gischel. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1935.

John J. Madigan to be postmaster at Vallejo, Calif., in place of H. F. Stahl, removed.

FLORIDA

James L. Crayden to be postmaster at Eustis, Fla., in place of C. P. Bishop. Incumbent's commission expired May 7, 1934.

GEORGIA

Herman E. Malaier to be postmaster at Chattahoochee, Ga., in place of H. E. Malaier. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1935.

E. Stelle Barrett to be postmaster at Union City, Ga., in place of E. S. Barrett. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1935.

IDAHO

Parley Rigby to be postmaster at Idaho Falls, Idaho, in place of Joseph Morley. Incumbent's commission expired April 16, 1934.

ILLINOIS

Chrystal W. Beckett to be postmaster at Golden, Ill., in place of H. F. Selby. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1934.

Clem Wiser to be postmaster at Martinsville, Ill., in place of W. K. McDaniel, removed.

Cora G. Rutherford to be postmaster at Medora, Ill., in place of F. E. Whitfield, resigned.

Milton O. Harriss to be postmaster at Pinckneyville, Ill., in place of J. N. Taffee, resigned.

Alfred H. Barrow to be postmaster at Roodhouse, Ill., in place of W. C. Roodhouse, deceased.

INDIANA

Floyd B. Faulkerson to be postmaster at Angola, Ind., in place of G. J. Shaughness, transferred.

Thomas R. Teegardin to be postmaster at Hamilton, Ind., in place of B. F. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired May 7, 1934.

Charles D. Manaugh to be postmaster at Hanover, Ind., in place of J. T. Nighbert. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1934.

Linda M. Peine to be postmaster at Oldenburg, Ind., in place of Henry Suhre. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1934.

James C. Rice to be postmaster at Spencer, Ind., in place of H. P. Willoughby, removed.

IOWA

Arthur G. Buchanan to be postmaster at Lime Spring, Iowa, in place of J. A. Ruesink. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1934.

Isaac Hoeven to be postmaster at Sioux Center, Iowa, in place of Allen Muilenburg. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

KANSAS

William L. Brumbaugh to be postmaster at Portis, Kans., in place of K. L. Lee. Incumbent's commission expired April 8, 1934.

KENTUCKY

Clifford O. Ducker to be postmaster at Butler, Ky., in place of W. C. Huddleston, removed.

Dennis L. Sullivan to be postmaster at Corinth, Ky., in place of Bennie Robinson. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Homer J. Northcutt to be postmaster at Covington, Ky., in place of H. M. Ricketts. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1934.

Marshall Norton to be postmaster at Hardinsburg, Ky., in place of A. T. Beard. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1934.

Marie M. LeBray to be postmaster at Nazareth, Ky., in place of M. M. LeBray. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1935.

Mary Virginia Garvey to be postmaster at Sanders, Ky., in place of A. C. Devore, resigned.

MAINE

Walter E. Hurd to be postmaster at Berwick, Maine, in place of R. R. Mathews. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1934.

Mollie M. Armstrong to be postmaster at Cape Cottage, Maine, in place of H. M. Armstrong. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1934.

John H. Gilbert to be postmaster at Monson, Maine, in place of Edward Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1934.

Grover Cheney to be postmaster at Wells, Maine, in place of R. B. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1934.

MASSACHUSETTS

Patrick F. Shea to be postmaster at Fitchburg, Mass., in place of J. G. Faxon. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1935.

Josephine E. Dempsey to be postmaster at South Ashburnham, Mass., in place of J. E. Dempsey. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1935.

MINNESOTA

Nettie Layng to be postmaster at Bruno, Minn., in place of Nettie Layng. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1935.

Alvah G. Swindlehurst to be postmaster at Cass Lake, Minn., in place of M. N. Koll, deceased.

Otto H. J. Zorn to be postmaster at Danube, Minn., in place of E. A. Voelz, removed.

Dennis E. Murphy to be postmaster at Dassel, Minn., in place of O. E. Linquist. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1933.

Gunstein D. Aakhus to be postmaster at Erskine, Minn., in place of G. D. Aakhus. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1935.

Donald B. Brower to be postmaster at Kimball, Minn., in place of F. G. Brower. Incumbent's commission expired April 2, 1934.

Robert B. Forrest to be postmaster at Lake Wilson, Minn., in place of R. B. Forrest. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1935.

Clarence H. Cook to be postmaster at Newfolden, Minn., in place of Martha Kleppe. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Herman E. Kent to be postmaster at Sanborn, Minn., in place of H. E. Kent. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1935.

Benjamin F. DuBois to be postmaster at Sauk Center, Minn., in place of W. M. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1934.

Arthur C. Jensen to be postmaster at Winger, Minn., in place of John Jensen. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1934.

MISSISSIPPI

Ira I. Massey to be postmaster at Ethel, Miss., in place of C. M. Breazeale, resigned.

Martha B. Lowe to be postmaster at Glendora, Miss., in place of M. B. Lowe. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1935.

Henry E. Wamsley to be postmaster at State College, Miss., in place of H. E. Wamsley. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1935.

Laura E. Turnage to be postmaster at Tchula, Miss., in place of L. E. Turnage. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1935.

George O. Robinson to be postmaster at Tunica, Miss., in place of G. O. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1935.

MISSOURI

Robert L. Ellis to be postmaster at Ava, Mo., in place of L. H. Pettit, removed.

Raymond K. Elliott to be postmaster at Bunceton, Mo., in place of J. D. Scott, removed.

C. Leslie Parks to be postmaster at Cole Camp, Mo., in place of E. H. Intelmann. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Elmer E. Sagehorn to be postmaster at Concordia, Mo., in place of H. E. Martens. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

William O. Morris to be postmaster at Eugene, Mo., in place of W. T. Thompson, removed.

Ivan Nile Knowles to be postmaster at Green Castle, Mo., in place of Glenn Vaughn, removed.

Charles Gentry to be postmaster at Houston, Mo., in place of W. E. Duff, removed.

William G. Warner to be postmaster at Lamar, Mo., in place of T. W. Box, removed.

Sadie E. Burnett to be postmaster at Norwood, Mo., in place of F. E. Hart, transferred.

Youree Douglas Adair to be postmaster at Odessa, Mo., in place of S. S. Rutan, removed.

Mary T. Barnes to be postmaster at Pilot Grove, Mo., in place of L. B. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired April 30, 1934.

Harry F. Allen to be postmaster at Powersville, Mo., in place of R. D. Eaton. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1934.

Eva G. Allen to be postmaster at Rutledge, Mo., in place of G. R. Hendricks. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1932.

Earl A. Seay to be postmaster at Salem, Mo., in place of C. R. Hayes. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1933.

Edward J. Dempsey to be postmaster at Shelbina, Mo., in place of W. D. Barker. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Abe Paul to be postmaster at South West City, Mo., in place of C. B. Robinson, transferred.

Edward J. Fry to be postmaster at Stover, Mo., in place of C. F. Hamrick, removed.

Clinton O. Brockman to be postmaster at Tusculumbia, Mo., in place of J. Z. Spearman. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1934.

Victor V. Long to be postmaster at Waynesville, Mo., in place of O. M. Anderson, removed.

Louis H. Barker to be postmaster at Willow Springs, Mo., in place of B. J. Drymon. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1934.

J. Talmage Loyd to be postmaster at Winona, Mo., in place of R. O. Foster, removed.

Mabel Smulling to be postmaster at Wyaconda, Mo., in place of H. E. Sherwood. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1933.

MONTANA

Mary A. Fetterman to be postmaster at Saco, Mont., in place of T. E. Didier. Incumbent's commission expired September 30, 1933.

NEBRASKA

Robert L. Isham to be postmaster at Chadron, Nebr., in place of O. J. Schwieger, removed.

NEVADA

Elva I. Hermansen to be postmaster at East Ely, Nev., in place of J. M. Fay. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1934.

Cyrus E. Hutton to be postmaster at Ruth, Nev., in place of A. C. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired June 20, 1934.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Frank J. Young to be postmaster at Hinsdale, N. H., in place of F. W. Colton. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1934.

NEW JERSEY

Frank J. Baker to be postmaster at Carlton Hill, N. J., in place of D. A. DeVries, removed.

James K. Grimes to be postmaster at Clifton, N. J., in place of F. E. Gersie, transferred.

Elizabeth MacBair to be postmaster at Essex Fells, N. J., in place of Elizabeth MacBair. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1934.

Irma M. Adams to be postmaster at Hammonton, N. J., in place of R. L. Buck, removed.

NEW MEXICO

Virginia M. Cason to be postmaster at Mosquero, N. Mex., in place of W. N. Brock, deceased.

Felix D. Valdes to be postmaster at Taos, N. Mex., in place of J. B. Martinez. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1932.

NEW YORK

Fuller F. Cornwall to be postmaster at Alexandria Bay, N. Y., in place of Henry Leonhardt. Incumbent's commission expired June 20, 1934.

Mary F. Villamil to be postmaster at Florida, N. Y., in place of L. E. Murray. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1930.

William J. Hartnett to be postmaster at Fulton, N. Y., in place of W. E. Gayer, resigned.

Howard R. Stevens to be postmaster at Hopewell Junction, N. Y., in place of H. V. Mulford, resigned.

Edward A. Laundree to be postmaster at Keeseville, N. Y., in place of H. W. Boisseau, deceased.

William McNeal to be postmaster at Montgomery, N. Y., in place of William McNeal. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1931.

Gordon E. DeVille to be postmaster at Ontario, N. Y., in place of R. A. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Frederick J. Clum to be postmaster at Pawling, N. Y., in place of H. M. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1933.

Robert P. Dumas to be postmaster at Plattsburg, N. Y., in place of Dennis Lamarche, removed.

Mary E. Gainer to be postmaster at Salem, N. Y., in place of Frank Wright. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1934.

Edward Fennell to be postmaster at Savannah, N. Y., in place of V. E. Bowler. Incumbent's commission expired June 20, 1934.

NORTH CAROLINA

Mortimer H. Mitchell to be postmaster at Aulander, N. C., in place of M. H. Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1935.

Robert Lee Bridger to be postmaster at Bladenboro, N. C., in place of L. G. Hales, deceased.

Tasker T. Hawks to be postmaster at Norlina, N. C., in place of W. B. White. Incumbent's commission expired April 30, 1934.

Elias Carr Speight to be postmaster at Rocky Mount, N. C., in place of G. T. Matthews. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1934.

G. Glenn Nichols to be postmaster at Sparta, N. C., in place of L. M. Choate. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1934.

NORTH DAKOTA

Nellie Dougherty to be postmaster at Minot, N. Dak., in place of B. E. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1931.

Peter Meier to be postmaster at Napoleon, N. Dak., in place of F. F. Davenport. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1934.

Julius C. Pfeiffer to be postmaster at Richardton, N. Dak., in place of J. V. Kuhn, resigned.

Emma Kittelson to be postmaster at San Haven, N. Dak., in place of T. H. Tharalson, resigned.

OHIO

Howard M. Whitehead to be postmaster at Alexandria, Ohio, in place of B. M. Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1934.

Raymond E. Fissel to be postmaster at Galena, Ohio, in place of W. H. Campbell, deceased.

Ray H. Strouse to be postmaster at McComb, Ohio, in place of F. M. Fletcher, removed.

Harold F. Sweeney to be postmaster at Russells Point, Ohio, in place of M. B. Craig. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1934.

Paul F. Dye to be postmaster at Urbana, Ohio, in place of J. H. Siegle. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1934.

Thomas B. Gephart to be postmaster at Williamsport, Ohio, in place of B. H. Moore, removed.

OKLAHOMA

Marvin A. Peacock to be postmaster at Fletcher, Okla., in place of J. W. Hinson. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1934.

Benjamin M. Luton, Jr., to be postmaster at Lindsay, Okla., in place of C. L. Bell. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1934.

Samuel H. Freeman to be postmaster at Stratford, Okla., in place of J. S. Goodwin, removed.

OREGON

Harold R. White to be postmaster at Wasco, Oreg., in place of W. E. Tate. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1934.

PENNSYLVANIA

Samuel U. Marbarger to be postmaster at Auburn, Pa., in place of E. A. Raush. Incumbent's commission expired June 20, 1934.

Leo F. Matthews to be postmaster at Brackenridge, Pa., in place of Benard Peters, resigned.

William C. Storer to be postmaster at Brownsville, Pa., in place of W. B. Edmiston. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1932.

Edward W. Coley to be postmaster at Cochran, Pa., in place of E. J. Fleming. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1933.

Tilghman S. Cooper to be postmaster at Coopersburg, Pa., in place of J. H. Fetzer. Incumbent's commission expired June 11, 1933.

Harry C. Beck to be postmaster at Cressona, Pa., in place of R. L. Wagner. Incumbent's commission expired June 20, 1934.

Robert C. Laird to be postmaster at Downingtown, Pa., in place of T. V. Miller, removed.

Raymond D. Kehrer to be postmaster at Eagles Mere, Pa., in place of J. W. Aumiller. Incumbent's commission expired April 22, 1934.

Walter M. Bauscher to be postmaster at Fleetwood, Pa., in place of E. S. Rothermel. Incumbent's commission expired June 28, 1934.

Michael J. Glenn to be postmaster at Ford City, Pa., in place of Jennie Larkins. Incumbent's commission expired June 16, 1934.

Charles A. O'Donnell to be postmaster at Frackville, Pa., in place of E. J. Monroe, deceased.

Jennie D. Seltz to be postmaster at Galetton, Pa., in place of C. F. Rugaber, removed.

Patrick H. Kearney to be postmaster at Hawley, Pa., in place of G. W. Murphy, removed.

Albert C. Beard to be postmaster at High Spire, Pa., in place of R. V. Parthemore. Incumbent's commission expired June 20, 1934.

Charles M. Howell to be postmaster at Lancaster, Pa., in place of C. H. Stormfeltz, removed.

Daniel E. Walter to be postmaster at Lebanon, Pa., in place of F. D. Heilman, retired.

James W. Byers to be postmaster at Mercer, Pa., in place of D. H. Cummings. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1934.

Kate H. Hayden to be postmaster at Midland, Pa., in place of J. L. Porter. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1934.

William B. Johnston to be postmaster at Philipsburg, Pa., in place of S. H. Wigton. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1932.

Joseph M. Hathaway to be postmaster at Rices Landing, Pa., in place of J. M. Hathaway. Incumbent's commission expired June 10, 1934.

E. Belle Luce to be postmaster at Saegertown, Pa., in place of A. E. Pettis, resigned.

John N. Zimmerman to be postmaster at Sunbury, Pa., in place of W. H. Deppen, removed.

Maurice J. McGee to be postmaster at Troy, Pa., in place of D. F. Pomeroy. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1933.

PUERTO RICO

Rafael P. Robert to be postmaster at Fajardo, P. R., in place of R. P. Robert. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1935.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Paul M. Davis to be postmaster at Donalds, S. C., in place of P. M. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1934.

John H. Payne to be postmaster at Johnston, S. C., in place of J. H. Payne. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1935.

Helen Dupre Moseley to be postmaster at Spartanburg, S. C., in place of J. A. Wood. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1934.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Louis E. Smith to be postmaster at Alpena, S. Dak., in place of N. B. Hammer. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1933.

Ian H. Maxwell to be postmaster at Delmont, S. Dak., in place of John Schafer, deceased.

Regina Trinen to be postmaster at Letcher, S. Dak., in place of Harold French. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1934.

James R. Crowe to be postmaster at Yankton, S. Dak., in place of J. F. Whittemore, deceased.

TENNESSEE

A. Klasen Broyles to be postmaster at Limestone, Tenn., in place of O. M. Hartsell. Incumbent's commission expired March 21, 1932.

Robert T. Lee to be postmaster at Madisonville, Tenn., in place of M. S. Luther, resigned.

TEXAS

Robert Rowntree to be postmaster at Bartlett, Tex., in place of J. D. Bell, removed.

Otto Hicks to be postmaster at Blum, Tex., in place of J. M. Stratton. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1932.

Earl B. Hopkins to be postmaster at Brazoria, Tex., in place of L. D. Campbell, resigned.

Theodore A. Low, Jr., to be postmaster at Brenham, Tex., in place of Henrietta Fricke, resigned.

Stanley F. Labus to be postmaster at Falls City, Tex., in place of S. F. Labus. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1935.

Wallace J. Bludworth to be postmaster at Flatonia, Tex., in place of F. W. Dusek. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1934.

James F. Atkinson to be postmaster at Florence, Tex., in place of J. F. Atkinson. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1935.

Robbie G. Ellis to be postmaster at Fort Davis, Tex., in place of R. G. Ellis. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1935.

Leonadis E. Eubanks to be postmaster at Groesbeck, Tex., in place of L. B. Richardson, resigned.

Sam H. Amsler to be postmaster at McGregor, Tex., in place of D. B. Gilmore, removed.

E. Otho Driskell to be postmaster at Mansfield, Tex., in place of E. O. Driskell. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1935.

Richard J. Bradford to be postmaster at Pettus, Tex., in place of R. J. Bradford. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1935.

Willis C. Giffin to be postmaster at Sabinal, Tex., in place of A. J. Durham, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1934.

A. Judson Pryor to be postmaster at Texarkana, Ark.-Tex., in place of E. E. Hudspeth, retired.

UTAH

Jesse M. French to be postmaster at Greenriver, Utah, in place of J. M. French. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1935.

John M. Bernhisel to be postmaster at Lewiston, Utah, in place of C. C. McGee. Incumbent's commission expired May 13, 1934.

Andrew J. Judd to be postmaster at Manti, Utah, in place of G. A. Jensen, removed.

VIRGINIA

Rosalie H. Mahone to be postmaster at Amherst, Va., in place of R. H. Mahone. Incumbent's commission expired June 4, 1934.

E. LeRoy Smith to be postmaster at Appomattox, Va., in place of J. E. Dinwiddie, removed.

Lavone A. Baker to be postmaster at Cartersville, Va., in place of M. P. Moon. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1934.

Dewey Arrington to be postmaster at Cleveland, Va., in place of S. B. Jessee, removed.

Robert B. Spencer to be postmaster at Dillwyn, Va., in place of W. R. Connor. Incumbent's commission expired June 20, 1934.

James F. Walker to be postmaster at Fort Defiance, Va., in place of J. F. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1934.

WASHINGTON

Marie L. Wenberg to be postmaster at East Stanwood, Wash., in place of C. J. Gunderson. Incumbent's commission expired May 7, 1934.

Gladys E. Gillmore to be postmaster at Medical Lake, Wash., in place of Theo Hall. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1934.

Tolaver T. Richardson to be postmaster at Northport, Wash., in place of T. T. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1935.

Andrew J. Cossier to be postmaster at Port Angeles, Wash., in place of A. J. Cossier. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1935.

Clifford L. Thomas to be postmaster at Sumas, Wash., in place of M. V. Garrison. Incumbent's commission expired April 16, 1934.

M. Berta Start to be postmaster at Winslow, Wash., in place of M. B. Start. Incumbent's commission expired November 12, 1933.

WEST VIRGINIA

Wade H. Brown to be postmaster at Jane Lew, W. Va., in place of Ila Lawson. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1934.

WISCONSIN

Dey E. Clemons to be postmaster at Brule, Wis., in place of H. E. Webster. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1933.

James W. Harkin to be postmaster at Shullsburg, Wis., in place of W. S. Wurm. Incumbent's commission expired June 20, 1934.

Blanche Delany to be postmaster at Sininawa, Wis., in place of Blanche Delany. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1935.

Alice M. Clinton to be postmaster at Sullivan, Wis., in place of A. M. Clinton. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1935.

WYOMING

George J. Snyder to be postmaster at Glendo, Wyo., in place of G. J. Snyder. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1935.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we wait for the blessed issues which are felt in the prayer of confession. Eternal Love, pity us in our limitation and minister unto our immortal souls. Do Thou forgive and encourage us. Keep us worthy of life's "well done" and inspire us with the promise of the rainbow-bowed throne. Enrobe us with moral earnestness and endue us with that rich, vital power that melts discord into harmony. We thank Thee that behind all energy, every blush of beauty, and every throb of human life standeth God within the shadows keeping watch above His own. Send us forth today not shallow-hearted but with morning zeal to fulfill Thy purpose. Merciful Father, move upon the souls of man to feed hunger-bitten lips and clothe wind-swept bodies. Arouse us with the majestic words which are set forth in the splendor of a truly good life: "Inasmuch as ye have done unto one of the least of these, ye did it unto Me." In our Savior's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, according to this morning's press, yesterday a solar plexus blow was struck against American industry, American prosperity, and American rights. It is very humiliating and embarrassing for a member of the Ways and Means Committee to be obliged to get his information as to tariff matters from the morning press. It has always seemed to me that that was one of the prerogatives of the Ways and Means Committee, but it appears no longer to be so, and tariff measures are now written in star-chamber proceedings behind closed doors, with the representatives of foreign governments participating therein.

I wish there might come home in full measure to the American people the manner in which their rights have been taken away from them under the guise of a trade agreement. Now, Mr. Speaker, every one of these trade agreements carries with it the favored-nation clause. The favored-nation clause is a treaty provision; therefore, it is a subterfuge when a tariff measure is written by representatives of foreign governments under the guise of a trade agreement. Any agreement which involves the favored-nation clause assumes the nature of a treaty and should be ratified by the Senate.

In this morning's paper we are told how gratified the representative of the Belgian Government is at this trade agreement, falsely called, but an actual treaty, that this is a "first step in a new deal of liberally conceived exchange of goods and commodities." Why should he not be pleased when tariff rates on Belgian products coming to this country are reduced by the trade agreement or treaty by 50 percent in some instances? The Acting Secretary of State in signing it also said: "More trade, more production, and more employment of labor in both countries." He should have said: "In one country, namely, Belgium." How will there

be more employment of labor in our country when tariff protection as applied to competition from Belgium is reduced in large measure? Where will those thrown out of employment by this change of rates, illegally and unconstitutionally made by representatives of foreign governments, secure other work in order to avoid the necessity of resorting to welfare aid? I have no actual authority for saying that this agreement has been entered into, but I assume it has in view of the great pleasure that it has given the representatives of Belgium.

Mr. Speaker, the American people should be aroused to the fact that their interests are not being properly guarded.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. For a brief question.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I want to know if the gentleman has knowledge of the commodities affected?

Mr. TREADWAY. Only from the press account. According to the morning papers the tariff is reduced 25 percent on cement, asbestos shingles, waterproof cloth, cordage, certain woven fabrics, and photographic paper; 50 percent on prayer books, shotguns, and silica sand; 33½ percent on various types of plate glass; and between 15 and 25 percent on various steel items.

I do not know how extensive that prayer-book proposition is, but shotguns are very extensively manufactured in this country and especially in Massachusetts.

Mr. EKWALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. EKWALL. Does not the gentleman think we will need a lot of prayer books if this thing continues to go on?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes. We will need more prayer books, and we will need more effective prayers for American industry.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have received a telegram from Purcell, Okla., as follows:

Have voted our limit. All McClain County schools, including Purcell, close Friday. Can you do anything about this terrible situation? Faculty will continue to teach if we can get any assurance pay will come later. Advise me immediately if you can consistently, otherwise our schools close Friday, March 1.

Mr. Speaker, I have received many messages of a similar nature from Oklahoma. The situation in our State is the same as it is in 26 other States in which I have made a survey. I have answers here from 36 States expressing distress in our school situation at this time.

There have been a number of bills introduced authorizing money for this situation through the Federal relief agency, ranging from \$30,000,000 to \$100,000,000. The Chairman of our Committee on Education has kindly promised to give us a hearing on the situation in order to outline a program or to give an authorization to the Federal relief agency for enough money to continue these schools.

I thought you would be interested in this matter since your States, through your State education departments have notified me of this need, and the members of the Committee on Education with whom I have talked would be pleased to have your reaction and your feeling about this matter in the next few days in the belief that education is necessary if democracy is to continue.

We spend Federal money to build roads. They go everywhere. A boy grows up in one community. If he is left ignorant, he may move into another community and live in that community in his adult life, therefore education should have a universal appeal, particularly in this distressed period. Then, too, since money is being used for different kinds of aid, especially roads and buildings, I believe it should also be used in an educational way. Educa-

tion means peace and democracy—ignorance means chaos and tyranny. Let us keep the school bells ringing in America. [Applause.]

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the House again to the very grave situation that exists in Mexico today relative to Catholic persecutions.

The other day I put in the Record quite a number of precedents where the United States Government during various stages of its history intervened in foreign countries to protect religious minorities and persons persecuted for their religion. I shall again put in the Record the result of additional research in the State Department archives. I find, in addition to those precedents (see my remarks in Record of Friday, Feb. 1), there have been many more instances where the United States Government intervened in foreign lands to protect, not necessarily persecuted Americans who may have been of a persuasion in opposition to that which prevailed in such country, but where the United States intervened in the case of natives of those particular lands, who were harassed and molested because of their faith.

In 1853 we intervened for the protection of Christian missionaries in Greece. In 1893 we interceded for the protection of missionary work in Turkish Kurdistan. This was in the administration of Grover Cleveland, the same Cleveland, it must be remembered, who sent a sharp note to Emperor Franz Joseph of the Austro-Hungarian Empire when that Emperor refused to accept as our Minister Keiley, because he had married a Jewess; and we can see Cleveland pounding the desk with great vehemence and proclaiming that the Emperor would accept Keiley with his Jewish wife and he would send no other Minister. In 1895 Secretary of State Olney dispatched the U. S. S. *Marblehead* to the Gulf of Alexandrette as a protest against the threatened massacre of Christians at Aleppo and other Turkish cities. The *Marblehead* was joined by two other ships subsequently, and there was cessation of the difficulties. In 1896 we interceded on behalf of American minorities in the Society Islands. In 1895 acting Secretary of State Adee authorized our American Ambassador to France to petition that Government to intercede on behalf of American Mormons who were being persecuted in Tahiti and other islands of the Society Island group. But most important of all, in 1870 we made direct remonstrance to Japan to prevent the persecution and banishment of native Christians in Japan. Below are set forth the details of this intervention. I believe it is one of the strongest arguments I know of whereby we can base immediate intercession in Mexico on behalf of its Catholic population. It is quite certain that the constitution in Mexico is a travesty and a joke as far as Mexican Catholics are concerned. They have no rights under it. There is a veritable avalanche of secret Catholic arrests. More than 5,000 have forfeited their lives. Priests, nuns, and bishops dare not appear anywhere for fear of arrest, banishment, or decapitation.

I particularly call your attention to these precedents because of the dreadful persecutions of Catholics in Mexico, to the end that some remonstrance be made by our Government. Convents and monasteries in Mexico are still the subject of plunder and brigandage, and those who do this nefarious work are unmolested by the Government; in fact, these acts of depredation are with the connivance of Government officials, and nothing belonging to a Catholic is sacrosanct in Mexico, and Catholics, indeed, today are being hunted down like mad dogs. Surely we cannot, should not, remain silent in face of such rapine, plunder, and cruelties to Catholics.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Would the gentleman advocate an ultimatum on the part of our Government, or what kind of intervention would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. CELLER. Just as we did on January 10, 1870, in the case of the molestation and persecution of Christians in Japan.

I would say that if the Secretary of State, in a very kindly, unoffensive way, would send forth publicly some mild remonstrance couched in perfectly diplomatic language, it would have a very much desired effect. Any pronouncement, be it ever so bland, would be helpful. Any hearing upon any of the many bills before the Foreign Affairs Committee would also help, but the committee disdains to aid.

I may say to the gentleman from Michigan, you cannot wound the sentiments and the sensibilities of 40,000,000 Catholics in this country by allowing these dreadful things to go on in Mexico without some word from our Government. Catholics comprise more than one-third of the population, and in power and influence the proportion is greater. They are entitled to some consideration, just as my people are entitled to consideration with reference to what is going on in Germany today.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; but does not the gentleman understand that our foreign policy is controlled by the Executive, and this body has nothing to do with it. Might it not be well to take this up with the President, with a view to having it taken up with our representative there?

Mr. CELLER. I agree with the gentleman on that, and I may assure him that numerous Members of Congress have petitioned the State Department and the Executive to take some suitable action in the way I have indicated; that is, in the nature of a gentle remonstrance. However, I am informed no such action has been taken, and this is the forum in which to criticize failure of such action. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CELLER. The precedents mentioned, which were dug up for me by Carl L. W. Meyer, of the Library of Congress, are as follows:

PROTECTION OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONARIES IN GREECE

In 1853 the trial and sentence of banishment of the Reverend Dr. Jonas King, of Massachusetts, in Greece, who had been accused of offenses against the established religion of the State, resulted in instructions by the Secretary of State of the United States to the American Minister in Turkey¹ to the effect that missionaries sent out by religious denominations in the United States to Mohammedan or pagan countries "are entitled to all the protection which the law of nations allows this Government to extend to citizens who reside in foreign countries in the pursuit of their lawful avocations."² At the same time the American Minister was directed to say to the Government of Greece in behalf of Mr. King that the President of the United States expected that a formal remission of the sentence of banishment should be granted. To this request the Greek Government declined directly to accede; as a matter of fact, however, the judgment against the missionary was never enforced.³

PERSECUTION OF NATIVE CHRISTIANS IN JAPAN

On January 10, 1870, the Minister Resident of the United States in Japan received from the American consul at Nagasaki a copy of a joint protest of the consuls of the treaty powers at that port against the contemplated deportation of 700 Japanese Christians "to parts unknown." The tenor of this joint protest was as follows:⁴

NAGASAKI, Sunday, January 2, 1870.

SIR: We, the undersigned, consuls of the treaty powers, resident at Nagasaki, have the honor to address you on the subject of the native Christians living at Urakami.

It has been reported to us that 700 of these Christians are on the point of being compelled to embark on board of two steamers and banished to a distant part of Japan, thereby separating them from their homes and families, and from no other motive than because they are Christians. We do not address to you this letter with any wish to interfere with the jurisdiction which you possess

over your people, but simply, in the name of humanity, to beg you not to adopt any measures of persecution toward the people at Urakami for the sole reason that they are Christians, for we can assure you that such inhuman measures will be regarded with indignation by the civilized world.

With compliments,

ALL THE CONSULS.

Upon the receipt of the joint note sent out above, the American Minister Resident addressed the following letter concerning this subject to the Japanese Ministers for Foreign Affairs, calling their attention to the disastrous influence which the persecution of Christians would exercise on their relations with the United States and other treaty powers:⁵

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN JAPAN,

Yokohama, January 10, 1870.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your excellencies' letter of the 30th of the 11th month, and of the 6th of this your 12th month (7th Jan.), the latter on yesterday, both relating to the treatment of native Christians in Japan.

In this contention I beg to tender you late intelligence from Nagasaki by enclosing copy of a joint letter dated on Sunday, the 2d instant, addressed by the consuls of the treaty powers to the governor of that port. According to 2 days' later intelligence (namely the 4th instant), her Britannic Majesty's minister then at Nagasaki requested the Governor to delay for 15 days the deportation of no less than the 700 of those unfortunate people (referred to in enclosure), but in reply was informed by the Governor that these orders were peremptory, and that he had no alternative but to send them in steamers to distant parts of Japan.

I cannot find terms sufficiently expressive of my profound regret at this occurrence and can only believe that you are imperfectly aware of the disastrous influence which this measure, if carried out, will not fail to exercise on the relation between Japan and all the treaty powers.

From the introduction of foreign science and of useful improvements for the benefit of the people, modern civilization is now deeply interested in witnessing the effects of Japan under the government of His Majesty the Tenno to take rank among the foremost powers of the world, and painful will be the impression abroad, and subversive of all feeling of good will now being created, when it becomes known that Japanese are being punished by deportation or banishment, or in any manner whatever, for professing, or pretending to profess, religious opinions in no respect interfering with the duties as citizens or subjects.

The absolute freedom in all matters of religious belief has been, and still is, a leading element of the ever-increasing power and prosperity of the United States, and nations may be said to prosper in proportion as their governments abstain from interference in matters of conscience.

There can be no friendship without respect; and if the Government of Japan now forfeits the latter by inconsiderate steps, its relations with other powers will be considered unsound and untrustworthy. The punishment or coercion of Japanese for religious belief will be deemed to furnish the measure of Japanese civilization and will be so regarded by all the nations in treaty with Japan.

The loss of respect, I need not to point out to Your Excellencies, will necessarily involve a loss of confidence. It will turn the friendship that now exists into suspicion of the ulterior designs of your Government, and may, in the opinion of foreign governments, suggest the expediency of being prepared to guard against contingencies in future dealings with Japan.

While thus submitting in general terms the effects which any ill-considered action of your Government in this important matter will produce, I may be permitted to express the hope that the Japanese Government will take it into reconsideration, and thus enable my colleagues and myself to officially contradict the impressions which the knowledge of the contemplated treatment of native Christians, as thus far announced, will not fail to create.

With respect and esteem,

C. E. DE LONG,

Minister Resident of the United States in Japan.

Their Excellencies

SAWA JUSANEI KIYOWARA NOBU YOSKI and

TERASCHIMA JUSKII FIYIWARA MUNENORI,

Ministers for Foreign Affairs.

As a result of the representations by the American and other envoys to Japan, a conference⁶ was held at the Japanese Foreign Office on January 19, 1870, on the subject of the persecution of the native Christians by the Japanese authorities, in which the representatives of the United States, Great Britain, France, the North German Confederation, and Japan participated. At the conclusion of the conference, Mr. Ewankura, former Prime Minister of Japan, expressed his pleasure with the "frank and open expression of your opinion" and voiced the hope that Japan and the powers would be able "to come to some understanding, which will save the necessity of further deportation."

On April 18, 1870, Mr. Hamilton Fish, Secretary of State of the United States, addressed a letter to Mr. De Long, the American Minister to Japan, saying, in part, that "the individual and co-

⁵ Ibid., pp. 456-457.

⁶ The protocol of the proceedings of the said conference is published in U. S. Department of State, Foreign Relations of the United States, 1870, p. 462-468.

¹ The Minister accredited to the Sublime Porte at that time was also in charge of affairs in Greece. The several instances of intervention cited here are in addition to those given in my report of Dec. 8, 1934, published by the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, Representative of New York, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Feb. 1, 1935, vol. 79, pp. 1362-1368.

² Mr. Everett, Secretary of State of the United States, to Mr. Marsh, American Minister to Turkey; no. 24, Feb. 5, 1853, S. Ex. Doc. 9, 33d Cong., 2d sess., p. 5; Moore, John Bassett, Digest of International Law, vol. 6, p. 333.

³ Ibid.; see also Moore, op. cit., vol. 6, pp. 262-264.

⁴ U. S. Department of State, Foreign Relations of the United States, 1870, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1870, p. 456.

operative efforts you have made to prevent persecution of this people are cordially approved by the Department."⁷

INTERCESSION FOR THE PROTECTION OF MISSIONARY WORK IN TURKISH KURDISTAN

During 1893 the Department of State of the United States received complaints concerning maltreatment of an American missionary in the Turkish Province of Kurdistan. Having reference to this incident, President Grover Cleveland, in his annual message of December 4, 1893, said that "information received of maltreatment suffered by an inoffensive American woman engaged in missionary work in Turkish Kurdistan was followed by such representations to the Porte as resulted in the issuance of orders for the punishment of her assailants, the removal of a delinquent official, and the adoption of measures for the protection of our citizens engaged in mission and other lawful work in that quarter."⁸

MASSACRE OF CHRISTIANS AT ALEPPO AND NUMEROUS OTHER TURKISH CITIES

In a letter dated October 8, 1895, Mr. A. W. Terrell, American Minister to Turkey, to Secretary of State Olney said that "for the last 2 days over a thousand Armenians have remained shut up in their churches in Pera and Stamboul, and nearly all their business houses remain closed. * * * The attitude of the Armenians in persisting in their refuge at their churches tends to exasperate the populace among the Turks, who pretend to see in it a demonstration to arouse sympathy among Christian nations."⁹ In another letter of the same date Mr. Terrell pointed out that "the danger now seems so serious in the Vilayets of Aleppo and Adana that I would advise the removal of missionaries to the seacoast and ask refuge on the war vessel of some friendly power whose boats are near, but believe that now the danger would be greater for our people while in transitu than if they remained calmly at their posts."¹⁰

Two days later Mr. Terrell telegraphed Mr. Olney to the effect that there was apprehension of a massacre of missionaries at Aleppo, Hadjin, Mersine, and Marash, and that orders had been issued for all Provinces to protect Armenians.¹¹ Shortly after this telegram had been received by the Department of State the U. S. S. *Marblehead* was ordered to proceed to the Gulf of Alexandretta.¹²

In reply to a note from the Turkish Government, Secretary of State Olney, on October 15, 1895, said:¹³

"The visit of the *Marblehead* to Turkish waters at this juncture is in pursuance of a long-established usage of this Government to send its vessels, in its discretion, to the ports of any country which may for the time being suffer perturbation of public order and where its countrymen are known to possess interests. This course is very general with all other governments, and the circumstance that a transient occasion for such visits may exist does not detract from their essentially friendly character."

The *Marblehead* was subsequently joined by the *San Francisco* and *Minneapolis*, since the situation had become very serious.¹⁴ On October 24, 1895, Mr. Terrell wrote a letter to Secretary of State Olney, saying in part that:¹⁵

"I am assured by the Porte that an era of tranquillity will now be restored everywhere * * *"

"While the present truce between opposing forces endures, it would seem prudent for our Government to secure, if possible, a treaty regarding naturalization, and thereby lessen the danger of being involved in the future conflict."

INTERCESSION BY THE UNITED STATES IN BEHALF OF AMERICAN MISSIONARIES IN THE SOCIETY ISLANDS

Since the treaties existing between the United States and France did not contain any provisions regulating the liberty of doctrinal teaching by American citizens in the French colonies, Mr. Rockhill, Acting Secretary of State of the United States, instructed Mr. Burton on August 6, 1896, that the intervention by this Government in behalf of certain American missionaries in the Society Islands "was necessarily confined to equitable representations that citizens of the United States in the French dependencies, who tranquilly obey the laws and regulations in force, should enjoy all privileges and immunities permitted to any other foreigners."¹⁶

⁷ U. S., For. Rel., 1870, p. 462-468. Mr. Fish at the same time pointed out that these "deplorable acts" had been committed "in the exercise of the internal authority which that (Japanese) Government claims to possess over its subjects." After some correspondence with the powers concerned, the matter was finally permitted to rest; see *ibid.*, p. 486.

⁸ U. S., For. Rel., 1893, p. X.

⁹ U. S., For. Rel., 1895, pt. 2, p. 1320-1321.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 1322.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 1323.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 1323.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 1324.

¹⁴ For a list of the places affected, the number of houses burned, and persons killed, see U. S. For. Rel., 1895, pt. 2, pp. 1453-1454.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 1327.

¹⁶ Moore, John Bassett, Digest of International Law, vol. 6, p. 347. For other instances of intercession by the United States in behalf of American missionaries, see my report on Intercession by the United States in Behalf of Oppressed Racial and Religious Minorities (of Dec. 8, 1934), published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Feb. 1, 1935, vol. 79, pp. 1362-1368.

INTERFERENCE BY FRENCH AUTHORITIES OF TAHITI WITH RELIGIOUS SERVICES OF MORMONS

In June 1895 the Department of State of the United States was informed by the American consul at Tahiti that certain American citizens, who were members of the Mormon Church (also known as the "Church of the Latter Day Saints"), and who worked as missionaries in the Society Islands,¹⁷ had been forbidden to conduct their religious services without a special license from the President of the Republic of France.

On July 29, 1895, Mr. Adee, then Acting Secretary of State of the United States, instructed Mr. Eustis, the American Ambassador to France, to intercede in behalf of the Mormons referred to above.

"I presume", said Secretary Adee,¹⁸ "that they have made their application in the proper quarter for such license. So long as polygamy was maintained as a doctrine and practiced as a fact by the Mormon Society, this Government refused to intervene in any way to protect them against hostile regulations or legislation of countries where they might be located. But it is asserted that they have now entirely abandoned polygamy. They profess to inculcate doctrines of the highest morality and promotive of good citizenship and loyalty to established government. The doctrine of entire freedom of religious belief and practice, prevailing both in the United States and in France, should, in the opinion of the Department, entitle these people to the same rights as any other religious society," provided they have actually renounced their polygamous tenets, and do in fact practice and promote principles of morality and virtue. Assuming this to be true of them, it is hoped that the license desired by them may be granted by the French authorities."

PROCESSING TAXES IN PUERTO RICO

Mr. IGLESIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, and in connection therewith to refer to and include several bills which I have introduced in the Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Commissioner from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. IGLESIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a request from the Legislature of Puerto Rico and several economic institutions to introduce in Congress two measures intended to give compensation for the results of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which are as follows:

Whereas in the organic act of Puerto Rico, approved by the Congress of the United States on March 2, 1917, there is a specific provision to the effect that the internal-revenue taxes levied on tobacco and other articles, as well as customhouse receipts, are reimbursed to the people of Puerto Rico for the general attentions of the Puerto Rican community, and form part of the budget of receipts and expenditures of the government of Puerto Rico: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That section 19 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, is amended as follows: Strike out the period at the end of paragraph (a), section 19, insert a colon, and add: "Provided, however, That in the case of processing and floor taxes collected under this title on flour and cotton processed in continental United States and shipped for consumption in Puerto Rico, a fund representing said taxes collected on said commodities shall set aside as a separate fund and paid into the Treasury of Puerto Rico in accordance with the twenty-third paragraph outlined under section 2 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico approved by the Congress of the United States March 2, 1917."

Another measure pertinent to the same subject is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 15 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) Upon the giving of bond satisfactory to the Secretary of the Treasury for the faithful observance of the provisions of this title requiring the payment of taxes, and under such rules and regulations as the Secretary shall prescribe to protect the revenue, any person may, after the date when this subsection takes effect and without payment of any tax imposed under this title, (1) process in Puerto Rico for consumption therein any wheat, cotton, or commodity competing, within the meaning of subsection (d), with wheat or cotton, or (2) hold in Puerto Rico for consumption therein any wheat, cotton, or commodity so competing, which has been processed therein."

I also present herewith the reasons given by the Chamber of Commerce of Puerto Rico, in general assembly, for the necessity for such legislation:

In inviting these organizations to send delegates to the conference in question, the president of the Chamber of Commerce of Puerto Rico expressed the situation in the following terms:

¹⁷ Tahiti and Moorea are the most important of the Society Islands, which are dependencies of France.

¹⁸ The italics are the compiler's.

¹⁹ U. S. Department of State, MS. Inst. France, XXIII, p. 139; Moore, J. B., Digest of International Law, vol. 2, pp. 177-178.

"The belated, unconnected, and vacillating manner in which the national administration has been acting with regard to the economic problem of Puerto Rico plainly establishes the fact of the great confusion which obtains in Washington concerning the subject. This evident confusion has created here a state of uncertainty, bewilderment, and doubt which has adversely affected all business activities in the island, adding to the difficulties of a situation in itself dangerous and highly prejudicial to the general interest of the community.

"The present situation makes evident more forcibly than ever the pressing need for joint, quick, and persistent effort to bring pressure to bear upon the national authorities to secure a rapid and definite solution of our problem.

"The national recovery legislation has been in operation in Puerto Rico for over a year, and despite our repeated demands for compensation, so far we have been allowed to share practically only in the oppressive aspect of that legislation.

"The present moment is one of extreme gravity, that imposes upon us a grave responsibility which a fundamental sense of self-defense should prompt us to face with determination and energy."

Acting on the strength of the above invitation, which the assembly unanimously voted to declare, expresses the present situation very aptly, a committee was appointed and directed to prepare and submit to the national authorities in Washington, through the office of the Governor of Puerto Rico, a memorandum setting forth the great difficulties created here through the lack of prompt and adequate action on the part of the administration and to suggest the remedial measures necessary to quickly relieve the situation.

In accordance with the above, we hereby beg to submit the following:

The present situation has been brought about by two distinct causes. The first has to do with the application of the national recovery legislation and its effects on the economic structure of Puerto Rico. The second arises from the operation locally of the Costigan-Jones Sugar Act.

OPPRESSIVE BURDEN IMPOSED BY THE NATIONAL RECOVERY LEGISLATION

The Agricultural Adjustment Act has taxed the people of Puerto Rico to the extent of over \$3,000,000 per annum, in the form of floor and processing taxes on staples that it does not produce but which it consumes.

The general advance in prices of American-made or produced commodities, brought about by the National Industrial Recovery Act has further indirectly taxed the people of the island—who buy over 90 percent of what they consume in the United States—to the extent of \$18,000,000 per annum. According to a study made by the Chamber of Commerce of Puerto Rico, the island has paid \$17,735,829.54 during the 10 months comprised from July 1933 to April 1934, over and above what it paid for the same commodities bought from the States during the corresponding period of July 1932 to April 1934.

In other words, the island has been called upon to contribute over \$21,000,000 per annum to the economic recovery of the mainland and so far has received no adequate compensation for this grievous sacrifice. To gage the real significance of this tremendous burden it will suffice to remember that according to the survey of the Brookings Institution, as far back as the year 1927, before the two disastrous and devastating hurricanes of San Felipe and San Ciprián, Puerto Rico was facing an annual deficit of \$10,000,000.

This increased cost of the commodities that we consume has increased by over 30 percent the cost of living in Puerto Rico, and since such legislation has not affected in a favorable manner the prices of what the island produces, the result has been that, contrary to the spirit and purpose of that legislation, it is exacting a great sacrifice from the people of the island for which they are receiving no adequate compensation.

We cannot conceive for a second that it ever was the intention of the Congress of the United States to work out the economic salvation of the Nation at the expense of its fellow citizens of Puerto Rico, a community facing starvation, which has for a long time been struggling under the great handicap of an increasing unemployment problem. Confronted by such stern realities and seeing that after one whole year the national administration has failed to proceed with equal promptness to establish here the agencies designed by that very legislation to offset the sacrifice imposed by it, no one could justly blame the people of Puerto Rico for the feeling that it has been utterly neglected by Washington.

As regards the second, the Costigan-Jones Sugar Act, the lack of diligence or neglect on the part of national authorities has been equally glaring.

SUGAR CONTROL ACT THREATENS ECONOMIC COLLAPSE

This act has ruthlessly reduced at the stroke of the pen the income of the island by 20 percent and that of the insular government by \$2,000,000, but no provision was made beforehand to offset or compensate such reduction.

In spite of the fact that this law had a retroactive effect so far as Puerto Rico is concerned, which was bound to create serious and complex problems, the administration failed to anticipate them, although its attention was earnestly and repeatedly brought to them at the time of the passage of the act. The result has been the virtual paralyzation of the whole sugar industry, which has thrown 20,000 additional men out of work, bringing the total unemployed to over 100,000 people, according to the estimate of the commissioner of labor. The paralyzation of the island's main industry has been instantly reflected in the general activities of the community which depends to such a large extent on that industry.

Owing to the sentiment as expressed by business, industrial, and agricultural organizations, the insular legislature passed the following resolution:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF PUERTO RICO,
San Juan, P. R., February 27, 1935.

HON. SANTIAGO IGLESIAS,

Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico,

United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: By resolution of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico, and in accordance with the provisions of H. Con. Res. 3, approved this day, I have the honor to forward a certified copy thereof, for proper action.

Respectfully,

ANTONIO ARROYO,

Secretary House of Representatives of Puerto Rico.

Concurrent resolution to petition the Congress of the United States to provide by law, as a measure of emergency relief and to promote the economic and social rehabilitation of the Island of Puerto Rico, that the taxes fixed and levied by H. R. 3835, approved May 12, 1933, to relieve the prevailing national economic emergency by increasing the agricultural purchasing power, be levied, collected, and covered into the Treasury by the customs authorities of Puerto Rico, in the same form and manner as provided by the Organic Act establishing a civil government in Puerto Rico, approved March 2, 1917, to form a special fund in the insular treasury, which fund shall only be expended by the legislature to meet urgent needs and to promote the general welfare of the Puerto Rican community, and for other purposes.

Whereas in the economic crisis from which it is suffering, Puerto Rico lacks the financial means to provide relief for the hardships caused by unemployment and the conditions arising therefrom, to overcome economic difficulties, to alleviate disasters, and to improve living and labor conditions;

Whereas on May 12, 1933, the Congress of the United States passed H. R. 3835, entitled "An act to relieve the existing national economic emergency by increasing agricultural purchasing power, to raise revenue for extraordinary expenses incurred by reason of such emergency, to provide emergency relief with respect to agricultural indebtedness, to provide for the orderly liquidation of joint-stock land banks, and for other purposes";

Whereas section 9 of said Resolution No. 3835 provides that, for the purpose of obtaining revenues to cover the extraordinary expenses incurred by reason of the national economic emergency, processing taxes be levied on basic agricultural products, including wheat, cotton, field corn, pork products, rice, tobacco, milk, and its products, and any regional or market classification, type, or grade thereof;

Whereas Puerto Rico is a Territory, organized but not incorporated, governed by a special organic act promulgated by the Congress of the United States, and is also a heavy consumer of such basic agricultural products, that pays said taxes that are not only a heavy burden on Puerto Rican citizens but are the principal cause of the rise in the cost of living by more than 100 percent, which taxes are covered into the Federal Treasury, and which, if they were reimbursed to insular funds, would provide the means for establishing a special fund for remedying economic difficulties and would be the basis for promoting the general welfare;

Whereas Puerto Rico is oppressed by the weight of an unprecedented economic crisis that has brought about unemployment that involves more than 400,000 persons; its borrowing capacity is exhausted by an insular and municipal public debt amounting to more than \$49,000,000; the sources of taxes are limited; and some works of collective utility and aggrandizement are paralyzed, and others are being developed slowly, all of which makes it necessary for the legislature to petition the Congress of the United States for an urgent and necessary remedy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate of Puerto Rico concurring)—

SECTION 1. To petition the Congress of the United States to provide by law, as a measure of emergency relief and to promote the economic and social rehabilitation of the island of Puerto Rico, that the taxes fixed and levied by H. R. 3835, approved May 12, 1933, to relieve the prevailing national economic emergency by increasing the agricultural purchasing power, be levied, collected, and covered into the treasury by the customs authorities of Puerto Rico at the time such products are imported, in the same form and manner as provided by the organic act establishing a civil government in Puerto Rico, approved March 2, 1917, to form a special fund in the insular treasury, which fund shall only be expended by the legislature for the following purposes:

1. To increase the fund for the construction of municipal roads necessary for the transportation of agricultural products to local and outside markets. For this fund there is a tax of 7 cents a gallon on gasoline imported into, or produced or sold in, Puerto Rico, which amounts annually to the sum of \$1,400,000, covering a plan for 1,500 kilometers out of a total of 7,000 kilometers of municipal roads in the island of Puerto Rico.

2. To finish the plan of insular roads, amounting to 45, and to maintain them. More than \$20,000,000 of the public debt of Puerto Rico, represented by bond issues for which the good faith of the people of Puerto Rico is pledged, have been expended on this means of communication.

3. For attentions of the insular and municipal public debt amounting to more than \$49,000,000, which hinders all progress and aggrandizement of the Puerto Rican community.

4. To furnish funds to the homestead division of the Department of Labor, and to further the plans prescribed by the Legislature of Puerto Rico for the establishment of workmen's settlements and agricultural farms and which plans are arrested by the economic crisis that oppresses us, a work that is the most important for social and human aggrandizement undertaken since 1919 by the people of Puerto Rico.

5. To rehabilitate all agricultural districts, principally the coffee areas, which, due to low prices, loss of markets, and disasters from which Puerto Rico has suffered in these latter years, have had to be exempted by the insular legislature from the payment of taxes, which has not only affected its budgets, but has also forced it to dispose of surpluses and special funds to aid the affected municipalities which have been rendered unable to attend to their public services.

6. To continue the plan for the utilization of water resources, for the establishment of irrigation districts and the generation of power and light, as a basis also for the industrialization of the island, since, as Puerto Rico has no coal mines, electricity is the white coal on which rests the future progress and aggrandizement of the Puerto Rican community. The insular government, by legislative action, has devoted large sums to this work, represented by issues of bonds that affect the good faith of the people of Puerto Rico, since, by amendments passed by the Congress of the United States, such issues affect the borrowing capacity of the island.

7. To promote measures to improve the municipal situation, health, and public education, to afford means of livelihood and work, and to meet urgent needs for the welfare of all the people of Puerto Rico.

8. To attend to the services of insular sanitation and charity.

SEC. 2. That after this resolution is passed, copies hereof, certified by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, be sent to the following persons:

The Honorable President of the United States;
The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the United States;
The Chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs of the Senate of the United States;
The Chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives of the United States;
The Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in Washington;
The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall take effect immediately after it is passed by both houses of the Legislature of the people of Puerto Rico.

MIGUEL A. GARCIA MENDEZ,
Speaker House of Representatives.
R. MARTINEZ NADAL,
President of the Senate.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6223) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes. Pending that, I ask that all general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, be limited to 2 hours.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and pending that, asks unanimous consent that general debate, which shall be limited to the bill be limited to 2 hours. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion of Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. MEAD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield to myself such time as I may desire to occupy. Members of the House, before presenting the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1936 to the House, I ask your indulgence for a few minutes to refer to a historical matter on this date.

THE CREATION OF THE TERRITORY OF COLORADO

On the 28th day of February 1861, 74 years ago today, President Buchanan signed the bill creating the Territory of Colorado. The Territory was formed out of a part of a greater number of geographical divisions than any other State. It is a part of what had theretofore been a vast Indian country. Parts of it had at some time belonged to Spain, New Spain, France, Mexico, the Republic of Texas,

and the Territories of Missouri, Nebraska, California, New Mexico, Utah, and Kansas, and part of it was once called the "Territory of Jefferson."

Colorado was a Territory for 15 years and 5 months when she was admitted to the Union on August 1, 1876, as "the Centennial State."

THE NAMING OF COLORADO

When the bill providing for the original creation of the Territory of Colorado was before the Thirty-sixth Congress, it passed the House providing for the naming of our present State "The Territory of Idaho." But in the debate in the Senate, the Senate amended the bill and struck out the name "Idaho" and inserted the name "Colorado", and officially christened our present State "The Territory of Colorado", as they then expressly stated:

For the reason that the Colorado River arose in its mountains, and there was a peculiar fitness in the name—

And also because—

the name "Colorado" is more appropriate and more harmonious * * * and is the handsomest name that could be given to any Territory or State.

Those statements were made on the floor of the United States Senate on February 4, 1861, and every loyal son and daughter of Colorado has heartily approved of that sentiment from that day to this.

THE NAMING OF THE COLORADO RIVER

The lower part of the Colorado River was referred to by several early explorers by various names. But history seems to agree that it was definitely named the Rio Colorado—Red River—of the West on August 26, 1540, by the Spanish explorer Alarcón.

The river extended from the Gulf of California in Old Mexico about a thousand miles up to the southern part of what is now Utah. At that point the river forked, and the name Colorado ended. The north fork came about 450 miles from what is now northwestern Wyoming and was many years afterward called the Green River. The south and much larger fork came about 350 miles from what is now the north-central part of Colorado, and was many years afterward named the Grand River.

Those two rivers bore these two names for over 200 years. However, the Colorado River never actually reached nearer than about 80 miles to the western border of the State that was named after it until 381 years thereafter, from August 26, 1540, until July 25, 1921, when President Harding signed my bill changing the name of the Grand River to the Colorado River. The President presented me the pen he used, and it is now in the State historical museum in Denver.

The United States Geological Survey shows that Colorado is the highest part of the United States. The highest part of the main range of the Rocky Mountains, the backbone of the country, runs north and south through the central part of Colorado. The eastern half slopes toward the Atlantic and the western half slopes toward the Pacific Ocean. Colorado is preeminently the mountain State of the Union.

Throughout the entire United States there are 64 mountain peaks over 14,000 feet high. One is in the State of Washington—Mount Ranier—13 are in the State of California, and 50 of them are in the State of Colorado; and 45 of these 50 mountain peaks are in my congressional district. So I represent "the top of the world." [Laughter and applause.] I have the proud distinction of representing the very crest of this continent. I do not represent as many people as many of you do, but I represent more mountain scenery than any man on earth.

There are some 300 mountain peaks running across our State north and south from Wyoming to New Mexico—a gorgeous crystal chain 300 miles long in my district. When you gentlemen want to visit the mountains, after viewing the foothills in other States, come to my district and see some real mountains. [Applause.] There are over a million people visit our State every summer. In the evening, when the sun commences setting in the valleys, it shines for a long time on the western slopes of that brilliant mountain chain, and as the last rays of the sun gradually reach the top of

those peaks we actually think that the sun sets reluctantly as it bids good night to that most sublime scene on this planet.

Mr. CELLER. And what does the word "Colorado" mean?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It is a Spanish word meaning "red." It was called the "Red River" by the early Spanish explorers.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BOYLAN. Does this conclude the gentleman's remarks about Colorado?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes, sir.

Mr. BOYLAN. Then I rise to say that I am glad Congress erected the State of Colorado, particularly when the election in that State resulted in giving to the Nation such an able and distinguished statesman and sturdy Democrat in the person of EDWARD T. TAYLOR. His life and works have been in true consonance with the lofty peaks of the mountains of his beloved State.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. RICH. And I can hardly understand how such a good gentleman as our colleague Mr. TAYLOR could be a Democrat.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I thank the House for its courteous attention. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want now to take up the presentation of the Interior Department appropriation bill. This is the annual supply bill for all the thousands of activities of the Interior Department for the fiscal year of 1936. The Department of the Interior, as you all know, covers a wide field of activities, extending from the Arctic Circle to the Equator.

It seems as if whenever the President or Congress does not know what to do with some new activity they put it into the Interior Department. The President has added 14 new activities to this Department in the past year and added several more during the year before, so that at the present time the bill that is before you today carries an appropriation of some \$11,000,000 more than it did last year. This bill, for the first time, carries the Bureau of Mines, and also the Geographic Division, formerly the Geographic Board. It carries the Division of Territories and the Division of Island Possessions.

That is one reason the bill is larger this year than it was last year. The bill carries \$58,755,656, but at the same time it is \$3,297,409 under the Budget estimates. We have cut under the amount recommended by the Budget by various economies, but it is still above last year's bill, as I said before. That amount of money is reflected largely in this way: There is the restoration of salaries from 90 percent to 100 percent of all of the Government employees, beginning the first of April next, but we figured here on its beginning the first of July next. That accounts for \$2,091,726. Then we have a new grazing-control law that accounts for \$250,000. The Wheeler-Howard bill that we passed in the last Congress, pertaining to the hundred tribes of Indians on Indian reservations and Indian agencies throughout the United States, accounts for \$3,275,000.

We have cut a little more than that below the Budget. The Budget asked for \$1,000,000 for the purchase of land, \$5,000,000 for a revolving fund, \$250,000 for organization, and \$175,000 for education under the Wheeler-Howard Act, and we have cut that down to a total of \$3,275,000. We have allowed an increase of \$408,556 for the survey of public lands, exclusive of the 10-percent salary restoration.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, how much was that last year?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I shall give that later on. I shall insert the definite figures. Our report and the hearings are very complete. The hearings cover 1,180 printed pages. The report is full, and if the gentleman will take the report he will find in the last part of it all these very elaborately tabulated, so that I shall not take the time to read the figures. It is a full report and a unanimous report from the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. If my colleague will pardon the interruption, it strikes me that when the Appropriations Committee cuts underneath the Budget experts it is contracting a very bad habit.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I do not know whether the House will sustain the committee or not. That is up to the House when we reach these various items, and I hope the House will give attention to it, because it does cover so many human activities throughout the entire country.

I could go into detail as to the way these increases and reductions are made, but I will first take up the departments in order.

The office of the Secretary of the Interior is the first one we took up. It will be observed from the hearings that we have made some additions because of the additional activities that are heaped upon the Department of the Interior. I may say, however, that we have given to the Secretary's office what they asked and what the Budget gave them.

In the General Land Office we show an increase over 1935, because last year there was a large unexpended balance which they did not have this year and which is not reflected in the 1935 appropriation. There is an increase of \$100,000 over the current appropriation for the Oregon-California land grants, which was provided for under permanent law last year.

The largest and most complicated item in the whole bill pertains to the Indians, the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The committee has recommended an appropriation of \$26,627,260. That is \$6,358,695 more than the 1935 appropriation, and it is \$2,997,675 less than the Budget estimate. In addition, the expenditure of tribal funds in the sum of \$1,312,280 is recommended in this bill.

The Indian Bureau is divided into a great many activities. Industrial assistance to Indians has been provided with \$3,720,490. For irrigation and drainage of Indian lands \$950,000 is recommended by the committee. When we come to the education of the Indians we will have a controversial matter on the floor of this House. The policy of the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs is to curtail and reduce and to eliminate to a certain extent Indian boarding schools off the reservation—that is, nonreservation boarding schools.

He feels that those schools ought to be established on the reservations, and that there would be a great saving to the Government if those schools off the reservation were discontinued. We have not agreed with him in that case. A year ago we did submit to quite a reduction in those nonreservation boarding schools. They are principally the wonderful school at Riverside, Calif., Sherman Institute; the one at Phoenix, Ariz.; the Chemawa School in Oregon; the Albuquerque School in New Mexico; Haskell Institute; and various other nonreservation Indian schools. We feel they have been built up in the last 50 years and that we have spent many millions of dollars upon them, and we feel that a further reduction should not be made at this time unless and until it has been practically demonstrated that ample provision can be made for the Indians on the reservation, so that they may have the facilities for acquiring an education.

So I say we have run counter to the Bureau of Indian Affairs on that matter. When we reach it we will go more into detail. The Bureau of Indian Affairs recommended absolutely the discontinuance as nonreservation schools of the Indian school at Carter Seminary; at Uchee, Eufala, Jones Academy, Wheelock Academy, and Chemawa, Oreg.; and also a reduction at Phoenix, Ariz., and Albuquerque, and at Ignacio, Colo., and other places. The Chemawa School was to have been closed completely. We have declined to follow the recommendation of the Budget and the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Interior Department in that matter, and we have restored in this bill an appropriation for the education of the same number of children at those schools during the coming fiscal year that were authorized during the last year. Last year some of them were cut quite a great deal.

On the item of general support for the Indians we have been quite liberal, and we have been liberal in connection with education.

Concerning the Bureau of Reclamation, we have simply authorized the maintenance and carrying on of those projects and of that Bureau substantially as at present. There is no new construction authorized in this bill. I may say that there is an increase in the operation and maintenance. An increase of \$25,000 over the Budget estimate is caused by the elimination of a similar amount for the same purpose from the general fund and its consolidation with the Yuma project. The increase, then, over the 1935 appropriation, other than the salary restoration, is due to increased repair and maintenance work, which has become necessary by allowing certain Indian activities, schools, and one thing or another, and irrigation enterprises to run down. We think they are justified and necessary.

Concerning the Geological Survey, we practically gave them what the Budget asked for. As I recall it, we made one reduction there of \$13,000 under the item for gaging streams. However, in the main, we followed the Budget recommendations.

The Bureau of Mines is an entirely new division, transferred from the Department of Commerce to the Interior Department, and we now must provide for the carrying on of that activity. The amount recommended is \$1,417,311.

Mr. ARNOLD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Certainly.

Mr. ARNOLD. Does the gentleman feel that his subcommittee has given due consideration to the necessary amount of money that should be carried in this bill for the safety work in the mines? I understand that at a great many of these places the equipment has become obsolete. In a great many places it has become absolutely useless, and it seems to me that, as important as this mine rescue work is, Congress should be very generous in appropriating money along that line. I understand further that it is the desire of those who are interested in this work that this appropriation be increased, especially as it applies to mine rescue work, and that the Bureau of the Budget is now considering the matter of recommending to this committee an additional amount for this activity. I should like the gentleman to discuss that a little, because it is a very important subject and a matter that should be given careful consideration.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD] that always after a committee has held exhaustive hearings and reported a bill there are a great many people who suddenly discover that they need an additional appropriation, and they come to me or some other member of the committee and try to get us to ignore the recommendations of the Budget and the departments and inject into the bill new appropriations without a hearing, without any consideration. Invariably I have declined to do so. I am fully aware of the matter to which the gentleman refers, and I feel there is a great deal of merit in it; but I have advised those gentlemen to present the matter to the Bureau of the Budget and to the Interior Department and get their recommendation. If they get that recommendation and send to the committee an official estimate, we shall gladly consider it.

If they do not get that in this bill, there is nothing under the sun that will prevent them from putting it into the deficiency bill when we come to take it up. If, however, we were to open the door now to a large appropriation for something that has not even been presented at the present time, we are setting a precedent that would destroy the orderly consideration of our large annual supply bills. That is the way we feel about it. We did give them some increase over what they had last year.

Mr. ARNOLD. I hardly think this would be a proper matter to be put into a deficiency bill. The matter should be taken up in the general appropriation bill, because it is not in the nature of a deficiency. I am wondering however, if the gentleman has made any investigation to ascertain whether or not the Bureau of the Budget allowed this service what it asked for, or whether the Bureau made a cut on this particular item.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I do not remember the action of the Bureau of the Budget on this particular item. I do

know that the Bureau of the Budget does cut down a great many requests, and they probably have cut that down. If they have presented it to the Bureau of the Budget and the Bureau of the Budget has rejected it, then it would be unbecoming, it seems to me, for us to try to put it in over them; and if they have not presented it to the Bureau of the Budget, they have been derelict in their duty; they ought to do so. I cannot see any reason why, if it is a proper appropriation to go in this bill or any other bill, it should not be added to the deficiency bill when we take it up. We have given them in excess of \$30,000 over and above what they had last year.

Mr. ARNOLD. I fully agree with the gentleman that we should not force anything into the bill that has no merit; but if actually it has merit, perhaps the Bureau of the Budget was a little in error in making their recommendation as to the specific amount they recommended. That is my object in taking this matter up with the gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The gentleman from Illinois himself is chairman of one of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations. Let me ask the gentleman if he believes in the principle of putting things in the bill handled by his committee that have not been considered by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. ARNOLD. We always try to give consideration to matters on their merit.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. That is not the question; does the gentleman's committee give them the money?

Mr. ARNOLD. We do not always give them the money because we feel sometimes they have not made out a justifiable case; but where they have made out a justifiable case I feel that they are entitled to it and that the Appropriations Committee should go along in an effort to do full and complete justice.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I am chairman of this subcommittee. They have never presented the matter to me up to the present minute. We are very sympathetic with the Bureau of Mines, as far as that is concerned, and we have authorized one entirely new activity in that Department.

Now I come to the national parks. We recommend \$15,713,890 for the national parks. This is more than the amount allowed last year by \$4,394,250, but it is \$44,640 less than the Budget estimate. The reason for this enormous increase is because the operation and maintenance of nearly all the Federal buildings in the city of Washington and many throughout the United States that were under the War Department and under various other departments for years and years have all been put under the Interior Department.

The Battlefields at Gettysburg, Antietam, and a great many other activities of this kind have also been put under the Interior Department. Whether this is wise or otherwise remains for the House to determine.

The Bureau of Education we have treated quite liberally. It is not a very large bureau. We recommended \$4,781,220. This is a trifle under what it was last year, but at the same time we feel that it has been taken care of amply and sufficiently.

The Territory of Alaska we have tried to treat liberally. The sum we have recommended is \$1,148,185, and this is in excess of the amount that was allowed last year.

The Alaskan Railroad is an item I wish particularly to call attention to. For a great many years the Alaskan Railroad was coming before Congress and getting an appropriation of over \$1,000,000 a year, and as high as \$1,500,000 a year, over and above its receipts for the operation of that railroad from Seward to Fairbanks, nearly 500 miles in length.

A great many years ago we built this railroad at the cost of \$57,000,000, and at the time we passed that bill we promised that it would be self-supporting. It never has been self-supporting; but, on the other hand, we feel that if we take away that railroad the population would feel like moving out of Alaska. It is a great highway for traffic and it is a wonderful thing for the Territory. In area, Alaska is nearly one-fifth as large as the United States. It is an enormous Territory. There used to be probably 100,000 white people—or something like that number—there, but

today there are only 15,000 or 18,000, and they are having a pretty hard struggle.

The first year I became chairman of this subcommittee we cut the appropriation for the Alaskan Railroad to \$500,000. The next year we cut it to \$250,000, and last year we cut off the rest of it and gave them nothing but their receipts.

That has proved too deep a cut; so for the next fiscal year we are recommending \$250,000, the same amount we gave them year before last.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. What do the receipts of the railroad amount to?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. That is set forth in the report.

Mr. MICHENER. Can the gentleman give me the approximate figure?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Not without looking it up.

Mr. MICHENER. Is this money to be used for operating expenses or for repairs?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Some of it is for operating expenses and some for replacement. A lot of the bridges we built there originally were wooden bridges, and they are rotting down. They are rotting out.

Mr. MICHENER. Are we going to build new bridges where all of the temporary bridges are located?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. Is it going to be the policy of the committee to replace those bridges with more permanent material?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, yes; and the equipment and things of that kind will be renewed from time to time. We are trying to get the best there is.

Mr. MICHENER. How about the highways?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The Richardson Highway runs from Fairbanks to the coast. It is about as long as the railroad. Both the railroad and the highway run from Fairbanks to the ocean, you might say.

The Richardson Highway is an automobile highway and has been very expensive, but nevertheless we feel it is necessary to the development of that country. In our appropriation for roads, trails, and dog-team trails, and so forth, we are taking care of that situation as well as the care of the Richardson Highway. As the gentleman knows, the Richardson Highway has been under the War Department until about a year ago.

Mr. MICHENER. Now both functions have been put together?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. As a matter of fact, there are not 10,000 people living within 200 miles of the railroad?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I expect that is true.

Mr. MICHENER. There is no traffic excepting the little bit of stuff which is hauled in to keep the people in Fairbanks or in that general territory up there?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. That is not quite right. Fairbanks is the outfitting post for all of that northern country, including the Klondike, the Yukon, and clear up into Canada; and the Canadian people have to bring their products to Fairbanks and ship it out over our railroad.

Mr. MICHENER. It either goes by dog team or highway?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. And two or three freight cars a year would haul about all the freight there is up there?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No. I think if we put the matter of the development and the maintenance of the Territory of Alaska purely on a financial basis we might as well move them out, because we cannot keep them up in that country where the thermometer is 50 below zero and snow 50 feet deep, with 6 months night and 6 months day. When we were up there we were able to read the newspapers just as easily at 12 o'clock at night as at 12 o'clock in the daytime by the natural light.

Mr. MICHENER. And fight the mosquitos just the same?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes. The future problem of Alaska, I may say, is a serious one. We have a lot of red-blooded American citizens who have gone up there and tried to develop that marvelous country, but they are having a pretty hard time.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has been there and knows all about the matter. His judgment is good. But does not the gentleman feel that there is no development in Alaska worth while during at least the present generation?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Permit me to give you the picture of Alaska, as I see it, in answer to the gentleman from Michigan. There are three great resources. One is the gold and silver and copper.

The Kennecott Copper Mining Co. is one big concern doing dredging operations. They dredge out the gold. Then there is the salmon and halibut fishing. There is the fur industry. Those three things have produced enormous amounts; I would say pretty well toward a billion dollars. We paid \$7,200,000 to Russia for all of Alaska. We have taken out of there pretty nearly a billion dollars, as I recollect.

There is this that sticks in my mind, however: Take salmon fishing. That is done by people who come from Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle, Portland, and San Diego. They go up there on ships with contract labor. The season is short for the catching of salmon. Some of the canning of salmon is done on the boats. They take from the waters adjoining that country all of the salmon and carry it out, and do not pay the people of Alaska a thing.

I visited the largest cannery in Alaska the last time I was up there, situated at Cordova. I did not see but one white man in the whole plant. His name was Williams, he was the superintendent, and lived in Seattle. The rest of them did not talk the language of the United States. They came up there; they work awhile and go away. It is also true that they can enough salmon to give every man, woman, and child in the United States two cans of salmon every year. The thing I do not like is the fact they do not leave anything in Alaska. They do not contribute anything to the Federal Treasury, and they do not do anything toward building up Alaska, although they take Alaska's great resources and go away with them. The same situation exists very largely with respect to the minerals. The Guggenheim concern controls their own railroad, their own commissary, and they run their own mines. They ship their products out of there. While it is true that has added to the wealth of our country in a way, yet the people of Alaska who are trying conscientiously to build up the Territory of Alaska do not get anything. They do not get their share of the great wealth which is taken out of there.

The same thing is true with furs. Those poor fellows go out with their dog teams and trap when winter begins to come on, and stay out a year. They come in with their catch. Many of them fall into crevices, many of them are frozen to death, and some are killed by wild animals. They take their lives in their hands all the time. They bring their furs into Nenana and other places. I went into one fur house up there nearly as big as this Chamber, and there were tens of thousands of furs in there. I may say that the poor fellows who catch the furs get very little out of it, but the buyers take them to St. Louis, the great fur center of the world, and there they are made into these fur coats and other things for which women pay fabulous prices.

I may cite as an illustration that my wife was with me in Alaska and we went into one of these large fur establishments and they had some of these beautiful ermine skins, white with a black tip on the tail. When they are made up into ladies' wraps, they cost enormous figures. My wife bought, I think, 40 of these ermine skins for 50 cents apiece and brought them home. Actually, this is almost robbery of the poor fellow who goes out and gets them; and I may say that the stock of fur-bearing animals of Alaska is being depleted.

This is the only criticism I have in my mind about our handling of Alaska, and, frankly, I do not know what the future of Alaska is.

Mr. MICHENER. In the development of any of the industries the gentleman has mentioned the railroad has no bearing, except possibly on placer mining, because, so far as the fisheries are concerned, the railroad is not near the fisheries.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No.

Mr. MICHENER. And so far as the Kennecott mines are concerned, the railroad is not near them.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. That company owns its own railroad.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; and we hear about the coal up there being developed. I think I was up there once with the gentleman from Colorado when we found that after they mine the coal up there they cannot use it on the very trains that haul it out, because it is lignite and, as I recall, they had a laundry to which they took this coal and washed it before they could use it. This is not going to pay, and why we should continue to invest millions upon millions in a railroad of this kind when we are investing money in a highway and the highway will serve every purpose that the railroad serves? There are very few people employed on the railroad, and no one rides on it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The highway is not opened all the year.

Mr. MICHENER. Neither is the railroad.

Mr. STUBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. STUBBS. I have been informed, I do not know how reliable the information has been, that no American citizen can get a job on our Alaskan Railroad and that practically 100 percent of the employees are foreigners. I was wondering if the gentleman could enlighten us along this line, and state whether or not this statement is true.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I think that information is wrong. I know Colonel Olsen, who runs the railroad as the superintendent, very well. He is of Swedish descent and comes from northern Minnesota. He is doing a wonderful work. I think the reason people cannot get jobs on the railroad is because they have had to cut down. They have reduced their employees to the very limit. So far as I observed the personnel of the railroad, there is no foreign element there. I do not think there is anything of that kind involved.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. DIMOND. From the questions that have been asked the gentleman from Colorado, it is evident that many Members of the House have an idea about Alaska and about the railroad that is just 100 percent erroneous, and I would like to have an opportunity to tell the Members of the House something about the railroad and supplement what the gentleman has so well said about the wealth of Alaska, only the gentleman has understated it about 50 percent.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Let me remark here that I hope the House will very patiently listen to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND], when he presents Alaska to this body. I hope you will give him ample time and opportunity to present the situation because he knows it thoroughly. He has been up there a great many years and is thoroughly capable of explaining it. There are many, many equities in favor of Alaska, and I do feel that we cannot think of abolishing the railroad, no matter what it costs, and we cannot discard Alaska.

Alaska is really a great asset to our country. I stated on this floor a year or so ago that I believed we ought to take the Matanuska district north of Seward and open that to homestead settlers and we ought to pick homestead settlers that come either directly or indirectly from the Arctic Circle of Norway and Sweden. The people who have lived there for 1,000 years, under practically the same conditions we have in Alaska, have been prosperous and contented and happy. Alaska, I may say, is 40 times as large as Sweden, and Sweden, as I recall, has a population of about 15,000,000, while Alaska has something like 15,000 white people. I believe we should settle that Territory with people who are accustomed to living in these dark winters and short summers and having terrific cold to contend with—and I may

say with respect to Sweden that they ship butter into New York and sell it there. Those people are prosperous and happy, and they are accustomed to farming in a climate of this kind; and they make a success of it. If we could have people of this kind go up there and settle on this land and have them produce what the country consumes, the situation would be quite different. I may say that in about 15 towns, when I was up there, I asked them what percentage of the produce they consumed was raised in Alaska, or what percentage of it was imported.

In every place they said 100 percent was imported. They do not produce what they consume.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. They have a growing season there of 120 days at the limit, and although millions has been expended experimenting in agriculture and all kinds of grades of stock the growing season is too short. It is different in Sweden. There they have a longer growing season. The Department of Agriculture found that they could get more than 90 days' growing season in a year.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I will permit the Delegate from Alaska to answer that. As a matter of fact, they have 24 hours of sunshine in a day, and crops develop marvelously in that time. They can grow more in 90 days in that country than we can in 4 months in this country. They could raise enough potatoes and vegetables to supply that country.

At the present time transportation is a monopoly, and the prices are so high because it is difficult and expensive to ship things in there.

Mr. WELCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. The gentleman has referred to contract labor in Alaskan fisheries brought in from San Francisco and other places. May I state to the gentleman that these men belong to the Fishermen's Union, which is affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. I know the gentleman does not intend to convey misleading information as to what is generally called contract labor.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Is it not true that they pay them after they get back rather than to pay them up there and let them spend the money in that country?

Mr. WELCH. No; I would not say that.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. They tell me that that is true.

Mr. WELCH. The representative of these men who appeared in Washington before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which I am a member, said they were absolutely satisfied with existing conditions.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. There is no question whatever but that the people who are exploiting Alaska are satisfied with the conditions.

Mr. WELCH. I do not think Alaska is exploited by organized labor.

Mr. SIROVICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. SIROVICH. I happen to be a member of the committee, and I think the chairman is right in saying that the people of Alaska are exploited in that Filipinos, Mexicans, and Chinese are brought up there under the guise of American labor.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Alaska and its people get very little help out of that work.

Now, as to the Territory of Hawaii, we have provided for the Governor and secretary contingent expenses.

St. Elizabeths Hospital and the Columbia Institute for the Deaf, as well as the Howard University and Freedmen's Hospital and other activities under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department, we feel have been provided for as well as they could reasonably expect. In most cases we have hewed almost exactly to the line of the Budget. We have undercut in the aggregate, as we say, over \$3,200,000 under the Budget, but we have allocated somewhat, making some shiftings and exercising our own judgment. We have four members of that committee at the present time from the West and we are pretty well acquainted with the activities for which we are endeavoring to legislate.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. RICH. A year ago when the Department of the Interior took over some million acres of ground for grazing, it was stated by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], as well as by the Chairman of the Public Lands Committee [Mr. DeROUEN], also by Secretary Wallace and by Secretary Ickes, that arrangements were being made whereby they would segregate the grazing lands of this country into one department. Has that been accomplished up to this time?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Not yet.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman figure that the Secretary of Agriculture and Secretary of the Interior, with the assistance of the President, are going to consummate that proposal as they said they would do a year ago?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I think they are trying to work that out now. We have not appropriated any money for them yet. They have not had a dollar. That bill of mine which was passed and signed on the 29th of last June has not had a dollar appropriated for it to carry out the provisions of the law, so they have not got it working effectively yet. They are working on it. They have held meetings in all of the Western States. They have 90 grazing districts under a process of being organized right now.

Mr. RICH. I think this is a subject well worth while spending a moment upon, and I think the gentleman is interested. I am interested not because I want to see it go to the Department of the Interior or to the Department of Agriculture. I am interested in putting the grazing on public lands into one department so that it can be handled efficiently and economically.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The gentleman is interested as I am in having an orderly use and conservation and development of our public domain rather than in having it exploited and destroyed.

Mr. RICH. Exactly so. I am interested because Secretary Wallace said that he would not object to it, and Secretary Ickes made the same statement, and with the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in charge of the bill, and the Chairman of the Public Lands Committee in accord, I hope the gentleman from Colorado will use every influence he possibly can to see that that orderly procedure is arranged for.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I am doing the best that I can, but as all gentlemen know, there is more or less jealousy between departments and between bureaus, and they all want to hold onto what they have jurisdiction over. It is pretty hard to get them to consolidate.

Mr. RICH. That is the point that I am trying to bring out, and I am glad the gentleman spoke of it first. Because of those jealousies, and because of the unethical procedure of doing things in not a good business way, we Members of the House should use our influence to see that those particular things are consummated, because the taxpayers back home must pay the bill of department extravagance. I see here that we have contributed for grazing under the Department of the Interior the sum of \$365,080.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, no.

Mr. RICH. That is for division of grazing control, \$111,080.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, no.

Mr. RICH. And for the expenses of a man here in the District \$5,000, and for automobiles \$250,000. A year ago we were told we were not going to expend any great sums for this particular activity in the Interior Department. If we are going to spend \$365,080 in the Interior Department for grazing, goodness knows the amount we are spending in the Agricultural Department is much greater, and we are adding to these expenses, and each year they will increase, and I do hope that the gentleman will try to bring his influence to bear on segregating grazing in the Department of the Interior and the Agricultural Department, because the heads of these Departments say they are now in accord, and if we ever allow it to get out of this administration, God knows we will never have it accomplished.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I sympathize with the gentleman, but the gentleman is wrong in his figures. The total amount authorized in this bill for the first time is \$250,000.

Mr. RICH. I am reading from page 4 of the bill. We are appropriating \$111,080 for division of grazing control, and for personal services in the District of Columbia \$5,000, and there is \$250,000 for automobiles. I take these figures from page 4 of the bill under the division of grazing control.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. If the gentleman will read the report and see the set-up and the total amount that is chargeable to the grazing division proper, he will see that the total is \$250,000, which includes not to exceed \$111,080 for personal services in the District of Columbia and not to exceed \$5,000 for the purchase and maintenance of automobiles.

Mr. RICH. That is in the report on page 16, but on page 4 of the bill we contribute \$365,080.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The gentleman is mistaken about that, the total appropriation is \$250,000.

Mr. RICH. I want to ask the gentleman one other question. The gentleman says that we have reduced the amount of this bill over \$3,000,000 under that requested by the Department.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. RICH. A year ago we said that we decreased the Interior Department \$17,000,000.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. RICH. But then we have spent in the Interior Department through other organizations or agencies like the P. W. A., the C. C. C., and so forth, over \$34,000,000 more; yet we claim a saving for the Department, and what are we doing this year so far as the Interior Department is concerned in the expenditure of funds from those other agencies?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. When Congress passes a bill, awarding a lump sum for relief work and the relief of unemployment and turns it over to the executive department of the Government to allocate and apply, we are not responsible for what they do.

I need not tell the gentleman that. Now, it is true the Secretary of the Interior is the head of the Public Works Administration. That Public Works Administration has allocated enormous sums of money, but that is not a part of the current running expenses of the Department itself. This bill does not provide for anything in the way of construction except a few roads and one other minor item which I have forgotten, but there is practically no construction in this entire bill.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman does not know what these alphabetical organizations are going to spend and what for?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No. If we pass that \$4,000,000,000 I apprehend the Interior Department will get a large amount of it and it will be appropriated to Indians, to the national parks, reclamation, roads, Geological Survey, and a dozen other activities. There are 25 activities in the Interior Department, but this committee has nothing to do with that.

Mr. RICH. I appreciate that, and I remember that a year ago, when we discussed this particular phase, the gentleman felt that the money that was expended on these public works and various organizations should be expended through the Interior Department. With the knowledge which the gentleman has as chairman of this committee, the gentleman is better able to allocate those funds in his department than if they were being expended by someone who has not given the proper time and attention to it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The trouble is that we do not have that authority. I admit what the gentleman says.

Mr. RICH. That is the point I want to make. I think that money ought to be expended through the recommendations of the gentleman's committee and not by someone appointed by Executive order or someone at the head of the P. W. A. who would not spend the money in orderly procedure. I claim that is the wrong way for us to spend these funds and that they should go through the gentleman's committee. Men who have had experience, as the gentle-

man has, and who know conditions in the Interior Department, should have charge of the spending of this money. I hope the administration will allocate these funds to the Department of the Interior to be spent by the committee appointed by Congress to look after these things, rather than by selecting some individual, regardless of who he may be, to spend the money as he sees fit.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The trouble about it is the law provides otherwise, and we have nothing to do with it.

Mr. RICH. We should change the law so that orderly procedure would be followed out. We should have never passed the bill giving the President \$4,880,000,000 to spend without designating what it should be used for.

Mr. MILLARD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Just for a question; yes.

Mr. MILLARD. I listened to the colloquy between the gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN] on yesterday with reference to the percentage repaid of the amounts due. I look at page 105 of the hearings, which is "Status of construction account repayment", and it says, "balance repayment contract deferred, \$152,000,000." How much of that was the moratorium granted by Congress?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. There was a moratorium granted on the whole thing last year. There was one general, omnibus, horizontal moratorium for a year.

Mr. MILLARD. Was there not a moratorium in 1931, also?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; there was. But let me call attention to the fact that on the page to which the gentleman refers there are 24 Government reclamation projects. Ten of those 24 are paid 100 percent; 8 more are paid over 99 percent. The total average of all payments on all reclamation projects to the United States at the present time is 98.6 percent.

Mr. MILLARD. But the gentleman has not yet told me what has been deferred by the moratorium.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The gentleman will find a full statement of the matter on page 104 of the hearings.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Is it not true that after 4 years' payments for construction costs the amount deferred by way of moratorium must be paid, and there is an interest charge upon the actual moratorium amount?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time for general debate to the ranking member of the minority [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not feel that I need say very much about this bill, as it has been so very capably covered by the chairman of the committee. It has been a delight for us on the minority to have served under the chairmanship of this man who personifies, to my mind, courtesy, courage, and rounded legislative experience. He is here for his fourteenth term. As the gentleman started out to tell you, he represented the peak of America; may I say that we have some pride in our district, as the gentleman finished high school in Leavenworth, Kans., the district I represent, while his father was the first legislator elected from Rooks County, in my State. On his route to the heights of Colorado, we helped him along the way. [Applause.]

I have enjoyed the companionship and association and expert assistance of Governor SCRUGHAM, who is an engineer and who knows all about mines and mining and reclamation projects; also the fine enthusiasm of the gentleman from Washington, Mr. ZIONCHECK, of Seattle, who is close to the parks and close to Alaska, as close as he can be and be here; and Mr. JACOBSEN, of the majority, who is very patient and constant in his work; Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, who is majoring on Indian affairs, since he comes from the State

where one-third of them reside. He is a worthy successor on this committee to Mr. Hastings. And to my distinguished colleague, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts, because he is an accountant aside from his other splendid qualifications.

So I will mention only two or three things. If any of the majority members of the committee desire part of the time, we may give you some, as there will only be my colleague, myself, and one other to speak on this side.

There have been general raises in the amounts in this bill all along the line. That is what I want to emphasize. They were held down a year ago because of depressed conditions and the economic wave, but now we have loosened up a little all along the line generally. That is where the largest part of this increase of \$11,000,000 appears.

One of the first things we had to face was the proposition of providing an Under Secretary. Now, that is a big thing sometimes; but here is the question that has come before us: They are having Under Secretaries in other departments. We do not know what they do or what the excuse is for their being established, but it is not for us to say that this Department cannot have an Under Secretary if the others are going to have one. Anyway, it is demoralizing to stand up and fight one new man on the pay roll when thousands are being put on without any legislative sanction whatever.

The half of this total appropriation is for the care of the Indians and the operation of the Wheeler-Howard bill that was finally agreed to on the last day of the session. It has been my observation that when a thing is agreed to on the last day of any session it may be looked upon with some suspicion as not having been fully considered; but it is the law of the land and we must accept it as such. I shall not discuss it at this time, but probably before this bill passes the Senate the Committee on Indian Affairs will repass upon the question of a policy to be pursued in the care of the Indians. Some provisions of the Wheeler-Howard Act are fine; they were idealistic. Some other provisions were not so well received by the sound judgment of sober men. It seems an iridescent dream and backward that they should return to tribal ownership, but that is only the final objective. As I say, our big increase outside of the general level has been for the administration of Indian affairs under the Wheeler-Howard bill, and we allowed only about half what the Budget agreed on; but the whole policy is a matter that must be decided again by the House and the Senate before the session ends.

The big item in the Indian affairs was the school proposition. This was debated at great length, particularly the nonreservation boarding schools. We accept the proposition; and we urge in all sincerity, of course, the need of maintaining these boarding schools as they now are. In some instances they were curtailed too far; but, after all, it is more or less a local commercial urge that is emphasizing their maintenance. I have seen the growth of the public schools about the reservations in Kansas; I have seen the great improvement that has come about in the rural schools, elementary and secondary, within the last 10 or 20 years, and this affords a fair excuse for reducing these nonreservation boarding schools. It is the policy of neither the committee nor of the Bureau to reduce them further at this time. The reason for their curtailment was partly in the interest of economy. In all fairness it should be said that this policy was not inaugurated by this administration but was instituted by Commissioner Rhoads under the other national administration, and Commissioner Collier is in accord with and carrying out the policy.

Big expenditures have been made for roads on Indian reservations. It has been my observation that none of the money spent during the last 2 years has proved more satisfactory in its results than the money spent for roads in the Central West and the West. So when we spend money for improving roads in Indian reservations we are spending it about as well as it can be spent for them outside of increasing their educational facilities and improving the public health. We have done these three things on the reservations.

As I say, we have emphasized the advantage of spending money for roads, and the appropriation for this purpose has been increased materially. I think this is about as fine a thing as we could do in the national parks. The national park system is attracting the attention of the country. Good roads allow people to reach these parks by automobile, for the parks are not on the main-line railroads, and all of them cannot be reached easily; but with the facility of good roads the people will come more and more to use the parks, and we will wean them away from going to Europe for their vacations and teach them the wonders and beauty of our own land.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Has the subcommittee appropriated any money for additional parks?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. No.

Mr. SHORT. That work is being done under the public-works program.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. We have not appropriated anything for any new parks. There is an appropriation for national monuments that has been set aside. It is very small. There are about 67 different national monuments that are outstanding scenic spots that are not big enough to be called parks.

Mr. SHORT. Does the subcommittee determine where the money shall be spent or is it spent on the recommendation of the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. No; we act on our own initiative in all things pertaining to the Interior Department, I assure the gentleman.

Several institutions in the District of Columbia have been placed under the Interior Department, among them St. Elizabeths Hospital, which takes care of the insane of the District and Indians from the reservations. There is a feeling, however, that the facilities of this institution are being abused by people of Maryland and Virginia; that they impose on the District of Columbia. I wish there were some way a real investigation could be made to determine the residence of many of the patients. It would be found that many of them come from Maryland and Virginia.

We have also taken care of Howard University, the great colored university of America, Freedmen's Hospital, and the Columbia Institute for the Blind.

In closing I want to emphasize two things: I served temporarily on the committee conducting the hearings on the independent offices bill in December. The two things which I stressed then I emphasize again. They have impressed me as being very important. I do not suppose my suggestions will be absorbed any more than water on the back of a duck, but, if I keep at it long enough and somebody else agrees with me, we may get somewhere eventually.

First of all, we ought to have a representative of the Appropriations Committee sit in on the Budget hearings. It is the President's Budget, of course, but, after all, it is only a recommendation to us. There are no printed hearings of the President's Budget. They say thus and so and we do not know why it was thus and so. We have not had a member sit in and listen to the proceedings. I therefore believe there ought to be a representative from each subcommittee sit in with the Budget and at least know why they reached certain conclusions. I think that could be arranged if we were interested enough in doing so. There ought to be some liaison between these two recommending groups.

My other recommendation is this: There are in the Appropriations Committee high-class, well-paid men, who serve regardless of changes of administration. They are in there and are kept because of their usefulness and their service. These men ought to be allowed to go into these various bureaus, in my opinion, between sessions, and investigate them, just like the Members would, although these men could do it better than we can because they know the situation. They know the institutions that come under their direction, and I think it ought to be arranged so that they could visit these institutions and bureaus and bring back to

us first-hand information on what ought to be done. I submit those two recommendations and believe they would help materially the matter of appropriating wisely. [Applause.]

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I, too, am glad to express my appreciation of the consideration which the minority members of this subcommittee have received from the majority members. I am indebted in this connection to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado, the acting majority leader of this House, Mr. TAYLOR, and to each and every member of the majority side on the subcommittee.

This bill, as you appreciate, is very wide in its scope. Its scope has been added to this year as a result of legislation already referred to, providing for grazing control, for the construction of roads, for action under the Wheeler-Howard Act in the field of Indian affairs, and by the transfer of additional activities.

The bill, as the report indicates, carries a total sum of about \$59,000,000—\$58,775,656—which is in excess of the sum carried in the bill last year by about \$12,000,000—\$11,910,790.62—but less than the sum recommended by the Bureau of the Budget by more than \$3,000,000—\$3,279,409.

The principal items of increases will be found on page 2 of the committee report. There are about eight items there, aggregating some \$12,500,000. If you will subtract from that total two nonrecurrent items, amounting to about \$882,000, and a further item of \$1,500,000 carried in the bill a year ago for the petroleum administration but omitted this year because of the fact that the applicable legislation has been found by the Supreme Court to be unconstitutional, you will find that the \$12,000,000 increase has been accounted for except for about \$1,700,000. The balance is distributed through the many items in this bill, being in part reflected in additional activities transferred to the Department of the Interior, such, for example, as the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going into these increases in detail. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. TAYLOR, has covered the situation thoroughly, and there will be ample opportunity under the 5-minute rule to go into any details which are not fully understood. I want to make just three or four general observations.

The members of the committee who were here during the last Congress will recall the action taken in respect to the so-called "permanent appropriations", automatic annual appropriations amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars. Action was taken with a view to bringing these appropriations insofar as possible, under the annual supervision of Congress. Action was also taken with a view to realizing substantial savings in the total appropriations. In this bill the committee will find a large number of these appropriations which appear here for the first time. They aggregate something like \$2,000,000. They have been brought under the annual control of this House and some savings have resulted. I am confident that as we go on, further and substantial savings will prove possible in the national interest. May I express the hope at this time that the members of this committee will cooperate with the members of the Appropriations Committee in combating the tendency which always manifests itself to create additional appropriations of permanent character.

Mr. Chairman, it has been pointed out that there is no new construction provided for in this bill except such as is represented in the items for road construction. The reason for this under existing policy is, of course, clear. I think, however, that we should also recognize its significance. It means, of course, that any items for construction which should properly be carried in the Interior Department bill will not be reflected in its total. It means that any Member of this House who desires to obtain construction within this field of the Government must obtain that construction by petition to executive officials in charge of emergency funds rather than through legislative action. It means that the Congress has no control whatsoever over construction items for the Interior Department. It means that we may see, as we have seen in the past, construction authorized even in the face of

definite disapproval by one body in this Congress or the other. It means that to the extent that emergency funds are placed under Executive control, we are continuing a system of two-fold appropriation, executive officials having the power to negative action taken by the House and Senate.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point certain tables showing the total emergency funds which have been made available to the Interior Department.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HEALEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Statement of public-works funds allocated for Interior Department activities as of Feb. 21, 1935

Bureau or office	Allotted by Public Works Administration	Impounded reserve	Transfer not completed	Available for obligation
Office of the Secretary:				
Service Division.....	\$28,735		\$4,000	\$24,735
Petroleum Administration.....	824,000			824,000
Subsistence Homesteads.....	50,000,000	\$35,000,000		15,000,000
Soil Erosion Service.....	20,000,000	6,000,000		14,000,000
Perry's Victory Memorial Commission.....	25,025			25,025
General Land Office.....	1,168,000			1,168,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	19,278,050	2,500,000		16,778,050
Bureau of Reclamation.....	105,476,000	14,000,000	330,000	92,146,000
Geological Survey.....	5,154,664			5,154,664
Bureau of Mines.....	477,750			477,750
National Park Service.....	36,310,740	6,000,000		30,310,740
Territories and island possessions:				
Alaska.....	175,500			175,500
Alaska Road Commission.....	1,596,000			1,596,000
Alaska R. R.....	210,008			210,008
Virgin Islands.....	1,481,330		145,646	1,335,684
Puerto Rico.....	759,000		759,000	
Institutions:				
St. Elizabeths Hospital.....	930,000			930,000
Columbia Institution for the Deaf.....	10,000			10,000
Howard University.....	2,294,811	500,000		1,794,811
Freedmen's Hospital.....	85,000			85,000
Total.....	246,284,613	63,000,000	1,238,646	182,045,967

Statement of expenditures and employment under allocations of civil-works funds for Interior Department activities

Bureau or office	Allocations from State allotments		Direct allocation for administration	
	Men	Estimated expenditures	Amount	Expenditures
Office of the Secretary:				
Soil Erosion Service.....	2,300	\$207,000	\$3,800	\$3,800
Subsistence Homesteads.....	250	120,522	22,912	18,480
General Land Office.....	231	239,200	12,000	7,160
Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	4,423	1,900,000	37,100	22,270
Bureau of Reclamation.....	60	13,000		
Geological Survey.....	245	226,795	146,150	137,146
Bureau of Mines.....	422	107,700	725	614
National Park Service.....	6,430	2,405,793	223,720	84,943
Office of Education.....	326	53,000	17,898	8,258
Territories and island possessions:				
Alaska.....	3,326	526,513		
Hawaii.....	4,000	850,000		
Virgin Islands.....	1,300	371,479		
Institutions: Howard University.....	229	38,703		
Total.....	23,542	7,059,705	464,305	283,040

NOTE.—Employment and expenditures indicated for allocations from State allotments are in most instances estimated amounts. Expenditures from these allocations were not under the control of the Interior Department.

Statement of expenditures under emergency conservation funds allocated to the Interior Department, fiscal years 1934 and 1935

Bureau or office	Allocations to Nov. 30	Expenditures	
		Fiscal year 1934	Fiscal year 1935
Funds under Interior Department control:			
Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	\$19,875,200	\$9,573,753	\$10,292,603
National Park Service.....	2,325,000	1,029,437	1,295,563
Total.....	22,200,200	10,603,190	11,588,166
Funds under War Department control allocated for Interior activities:			
Soil Erosion Service.....	2,330,584	179,250	2,151,334
General Land Office.....	46,430	10,341	30,089
Bureau of Reclamation.....	236,150		236,150

Statement of expenditures—Continued

Bureau or office	Allocations to Nov. 30	Expenditures	
		Fiscal year 1934	Fiscal year 1935
Funds under War Department control allocated for Interior activities—Continued.			
National Park Service:			
National parks.....	\$7,008,108	\$3,573,172	\$4,199,497
Hawaii National Park.....	225,947	79,013	177,319
State parks.....	21,957,170	7,914,327	14,045,739
Office of Education.....	32,229	8,539	17,000
Territories and island possessions:			
Hawaii.....	533,885	185,922	764,246
Virgin Islands.....	55,038		72,000
Total.....	32,425,541	11,956,564	21,693,374
Grand total.....	54,625,741	22,559,754	33,281,540

NOTE.—The above statement does not include amounts for War Department C. C. C. enrollees assigned to Interior Department activities.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The Committee will note that the total includes \$246,284,613 from the Public Works Administration funds, \$7,524,010 from the Civil Works Administration funds, and \$54,625,741 from the Emergency Conservation fund, a total of \$310,434,364.

I ask permission also, Mr. Chairman, to insert in the RECORD at this point tables showing expenditures under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXHIBIT A

Summary of expenditures of Agricultural Adjustment Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture, office of the comptroller, through Sept. 30, 1934, analyzed by State and character

State	Total expenditures	Character of expenditures		
		General administrative	Rental and benefit	Removal of surplus
Washington, D. C.....	\$13,545,708.16	\$11,686,577.05		\$1,859,131.11
Canada.....	105.61	105.61		
Europe.....	10,840.10	10,840.10		
China and Japan.....	5,335.08	5,335.08		
Alabama.....	14,687,616.15	1,013,548.73	\$13,674,067.42	
Arizona.....	620,186.68	34,580.20	585,606.48	
Arkansas.....	16,102,101.40	733,330.37	15,368,771.03	
California.....	5,929,562.66	236,821.00	2,403,959.73	3,288,781.93
Colorado.....	1,883,644.28	128,760.45	1,700,729.83	54,154.00
Connecticut.....	355,527.25	46,823.96	308,703.29	
Delaware.....	109,288.19	17,583.80	91,704.39	
Florida.....	782,495.74	104,176.85	678,318.89	
Georgia.....	14,169,453.14	868,960.32	13,219,364.82	81,119.00
Hawaii.....	10,869.69	10,869.69		
Idaho.....	2,569,193.25	96,000.06	2,473,193.19	
Illinois.....	43,689,381.02	363,446.59	8,847,124.95	34,478,809.48
Indiana.....	10,590,002.81	204,785.11	10,385,217.70	
Iowa.....	28,429,430.50	316,904.97	28,112,525.53	
Kansas.....	25,119,647.10	295,374.46	24,824,272.64	
Kentucky.....	3,184,425.44	189,120.89	2,995,304.55	
Louisiana.....	7,774,982.79	458,950.06	7,316,032.73	
Maine.....	17,780.96	17,780.96		
Maryland.....	984,955.91	109,462.34	875,493.57	
Massachusetts.....	359,022.86	82,734.05	276,288.81	
Michigan.....	1,243,206.49	138,075.93	1,105,130.56	
Minnesota.....	48,215,268.59	289,997.57	8,866,097.64	39,059,173.38
Mississippi.....	15,595,803.39	850,419.28	14,745,384.11	
Missouri.....	47,139,950.64	389,240.65	13,980,032.34	32,770,677.65
Montana.....	4,878,257.96	127,322.43	4,750,935.53	
Nebraska.....	30,542,540.75	313,784.65	14,746,387.87	15,482,368.23
Nevada.....	78,090.82	29,779.92	48,310.90	
New Hampshire.....	28,306.37	16,419.92	11,886.45	
New Jersey.....	97,076.38	88,061.60	9,014.78	
New Mexico.....	1,148,002.93	87,573.08	1,060,429.85	
New York.....	428,677.33	342,332.58	86,344.75	
North Carolina.....	11,331,448.63	724,724.52	10,606,724.11	
North Dakota.....	11,180,429.02	221,816.62	10,958,612.40	
Ohio.....	10,048,919.36	328,664.68	9,720,254.68	585,729.87
Oklahoma.....	21,219,188.00	658,875.84	20,560,312.16	
Oregon.....	7,630,672.69	90,265.77	1,898,972.78	5,641,434.14
Pennsylvania.....	971,375.38	192,200.19	779,175.19	
Puerto Rico.....	1,153,051.50		1,153,051.50	
Rhode Island.....	14,732.58	14,695.74	36.84	
South Carolina.....	9,826,766.92	691,604.80	9,135,162.12	
South Dakota.....	9,164,771.96	266,936.22	8,897,835.74	
Tennessee.....	6,557,290.66	410,679.55	6,146,611.11	
Texas.....	63,377,798.99	1,759,192.13	61,618,606.86	
Utah.....	621,639.82	59,533.25	562,106.57	
Vermont.....	31,017.76	24,348.15	6,669.61	
Virginia.....	2,213,174.52	236,273.89	1,976,900.63	
Washington.....	4,468,597.90	79,778.76	4,388,819.14	
West Virginia.....	248,837.07	77,315.39	171,521.68	
Wisconsin.....	3,921,893.84	212,621.66	3,709,272.18	
Wyoming.....	401,141.51	64,204.67	336,936.84	
Total.....	504,714,486.53	25,819,621.14	345,593,486.60	133,301,378.79

EXHIBIT B

Rental and benefit payments of Agricultural Adjustment Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Comptroller, through Sept. 30, 1934, analyzed by State and commodity

State	Schedule	Total	Cotton	Wheat	Tobacco	Corn-hogs
Alabama	2	\$13,674,067.42	\$13,483,119.13		\$1,566.00	\$189,382.29
Arizona	3	585,606.48	553,105.53	\$15,332.95		17,168.00
Arkansas	4	15,368,771.03	14,949,959.56	1,945.00	180.00	416,686.47
California	5	2,403,959.73	625,014.54	990,918.57		788,026.62
Colorado	6	1,700,729.83		1,545,747.92		154,981.91
Connecticut	7	308,703.29			296,525.54	12,177.75
Delaware	8	91,704.39		78,262.39		13,442.00
Florida	9	678,318.89	365,502.91		189,162.58	123,653.40
Georgia	10	13,219,364.82	11,682,589.27	5,786.57	1,461,344.36	69,644.62
Idaho	11	2,473,193.19		2,435,449.42		37,743.77
Illinois	12	8,847,124.95		1,849,931.17	267.95	6,996,925.83
Indiana	13	10,385,217.70		1,489,332.90	72,884.23	8,823,000.57
Iowa	14	28,112,525.53		309,728.08		27,802,797.45
Kansas	15	24,824,272.64	3,052.00	18,285,924.33	3,192.00	6,532,104.31
Kentucky	16	2,995,304.55	66,307.14	190,230.01	2,643,165.83	95,601.57
Louisiana	17	7,316,032.73	7,316,032.73			
Maryland	18	875,493.57		646,939.95	36,995.32	191,558.29
Massachusetts	19	276,288.81			117,355.86	158,932.95
Michigan	20	1,105,130.56		612,620.78		492,509.78
Minnesota	21	8,866,097.64		1,349,458.28	27,860.14	7,488,779.22
Mississippi	22	14,745,384.11	14,745,384.11			
Missouri	23	13,980,032.34	2,501,283.06	1,206,833.50	54,009.23	10,217,906.55
Montana	24	4,750,935.53		4,614,928.71		136,006.82
Nebraska	25	14,746,387.87		4,367,375.30		10,379,012.57
Nevada	26	48,310.90		22,630.41		25,680.49
New Hampshire	27	11,836.45			2,594.30	9,292.15
New Jersey	28	9,014.78		8,915.82		98.96
New Mexico	29	1,060,429.85	608,949.31	350,245.68		92,234.86
New York	30	86,344.75		33,408.07	26,820.01	26,116.67
North Carolina	31	10,606,724.11	4,894,484.01	41,464.24	5,562,064.77	108,711.09
North Dakota	32	10,958,612.40		10,500,672.59		457,939.81
Ohio	33	9,134,524.81		1,288,314.16	482,432.30	7,363,778.35
Oklahoma	34	20,560,312.16	14,549,815.82	5,050,183.37		954,313.27
Oregon	35	1,898,972.78		1,882,077.28		16,895.50
Pennsylvania	36	779,175.19		206,501.58	545,843.71	26,829.90
Puerto Rico	37	1,158,051.50			1,158,051.50	
Rhode Island	38	36.84				36.84
South Carolina	39	9,135,162.12	7,301,343.79		1,815,813.13	18,005.20
South Dakota	40	8,897,835.74		3,662,319.29		5,235,516.45
Tennessee	41	6,146,611.11	4,729,155.33	93,126.84	644,566.18	679,762.76
Texas	42	61,618,606.86	56,062,697.94	4,105,599.83		1,450,309.09
Utah	43	562,106.57		490,811.40		71,295.17
Vermont	44	6,669.61			2,833.33	3,836.28
Virginia	45	1,970,900.63	236,963.86	416,091.31	645,663.48	678,181.98
Washington	46	4,388,819.14		4,089,734.28		299,084.86
West Virginia	47	171,521.68		53,892.00	33,672.18	83,957.50
Wisconsin	48	3,709,272.18		29,447.32	517,429.20	3,162,395.66
Wyoming	49	336,936.84		293,917.77		43,019.07
Total		345,593,486.60	154,674,759.74	72,631,099.08	16,342,293.13	101,945,334.65

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have placed these tables in the RECORD in the light of the discussion on the floor yesterday resulting from the statement by the very able Representative, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN]. The Members will notice that the tables indicate that there had been expended as of September 30 last, by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration for the purpose of rentals and benefits, for the removal of surplus and for administration expenses in this connection, the sum of \$504,714,486.53. The money was, of course, spent under the general policy of the Department of Agriculture with a view to reducing surplus in the hope of increasing the purchasing power of the farmer.

In contrast with this policy the evidence before the committee indicates that the total value of crops grown on reclamation projects in this country since 1906 has amounted to approximately \$2,000,000,000. It further indicates that the Public Works Administration has made available for reclamation work and similar purposes through the Indian Service to the extent of \$6,139,000 and through the Reclamation Service in respect of 41 projects to the extent of \$105,390,000, or a total of \$111,529,000.

I may add that if I am correctly advised, there has been no congressional consideration or approval of 18 of the 41 projects referred to.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. The gentleman referred a moment ago to the fact that a great deal of the construction work that has been conducted by the Department of the Interior has been made from funds not appropriated directly for that purpose by this Congress. It is true, is it not, that there is to be constructed shortly a new building for the Department of the Interior, which is also to be financed out of these so-called "emergency appropriations?"

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I assume that if the building is constructed it will be financed out of such funds as may be made available under the \$4,800,000,000 bill now under consideration by the Senate or such other legislation of emergency character as may be enacted into law.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Is it not also a fact that the Members of the Congress have had no opportunity to determine where such buildings should be placed or to determine whether their intended location is in the right place according to the plans that have been formulated in the past for the general arrangement of buildings in Washington?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Under existing policy that seems to be taken entirely out of the hands of Congress.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Does not the gentleman think that Congress should have the power to determine the location of these new buildings in order to carry out, consistently, the general plan for the development of the Capital City?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think the Congress should have that power, just as I think it should have power in respect to the expenditure involved in the construction of such buildings.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. We have expended millions of dollars for the development of the so-called "Triangle project", assuming it would bear a certain relationship to the development of the city in the future; and now, as I understand it, the Secretary of the Interior, without any specific authority from Congress, utilizing emergency funds, is to construct a Department building which bears no relationship at all to the general plan that it was intended the city should follow in its future growth.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I have inserted certain figures in the RECORD for the purpose of emphasizing the fact, as I see it, that two of the great departments of this Government are moving in inconsistent, if not opposite, directions; also for the purpose of emphasizing the

further fact that the people of this country have been called upon for over \$504,000,000 for the purpose of reducing surplus, while at the same time they have been called upon for over \$111,000,000 for the purpose, among others, of increasing that surplus. I emphasize also the fact that Congress has, in large measure, tied its own hands in respect of both policies, delegating its normal powers to the executive branch of the Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE. I am just wondering if the gentleman realizes that we lost our foreign market largely through putting up the tariff walls after the World War for the benefit of the eastern manufacturers and that this \$111,000,000, which the gentleman so deeply regrets we are spending for irrigation works, is a permanent investment that will be of use in the years to come, and is not wasted.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Without attempting to discuss the causes contributing to the loss of our foreign markets, I may say to my colleague that I am not endeavoring either to criticize or to approve the reclamation policy to which he refers. At one time or another I have been in every State of the Union. I have a great regard for the gentleman's State. I am, of course, anxious to see his State and every other State prosper. The point which I make is that one great department appears to be pursuing one policy while another great department pursues a contrary or inconsistent policy. It is difficult to reach the conclusion that both of these policies can be right.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other fact to which brief reference may be made. The evidence submitted to the committee demonstrates clearly that an increase in the cost of living is in process and that a further increase is anticipated during the next fiscal year. I shall not go into detail. The committee will find in the hearings estimated increases in the price of fuel to the extent of 22 percent, of food to the extent of from 15 to 20 percent, of paper to the extent of 16 percent—of a substantial increase in the general cost of living. A substantial part of the increase carried in this bill is explained in this way. The Government is no exception to the rule that all must meet the burden resulting from the general increase in the cost of living which is in prospect.

One other word, Mr. Chairman, in closing: The distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] suggested some time ago the advisability of closer cooperation, more especially when Congress is not in session, between the appropriations subcommittees and the various units, the expenditures of which it is their duty to supervise and control.

The suggestion is one which, in my judgment, merits the serious consideration of the leadership of this House and the House as a whole.

If Members will study the bill under consideration closely, they will find some of the difficulties by which a subcommittee is confronted. They will find included not only ordinary funds but emergency funds, cooperative funds from the several State private funds, and funds under appropriations heretofore of permanent character. They will find lack of uniformity in reports as between different units requesting funds. They will find 12 pages of closely written transfers which play their part in the figures in this bill. In these times, when so many questions of vital importance are before the Congress, it is particularly difficult for the Appropriations Committee to exercise effective control.

I believe that if proper arrangement could be made for cooperation between representatives of the subcommittees and the various units which they regulate, especially during the periods when Congress is not in session, we should all of us be surprised at the substantial savings which would be realized in the interest of the taxpayers of this Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, yesterday afternoon some remarks were made which, I think, should be corrected in the discussion of this bill. I wish to point out to our distinguished chairman and other members of the committee that I have been a resident of Colorado. I know something about what takes place on the frontier. I know what that piece of Scripture meant when it said that the young men returned to the wells of their fathers and cleaned them out to the end that their livestock might have water. I know what water is in a desert country. I know what water means to those hidden valleys in the Rocky Mountains which I have learned to love. At the same time I have in mind the great sacrifices of those great spirits who have developed the West, and who are out there today with their increasing families, more intensely farming the limited acres they have to the end that there may be homes for an increasing population, and I cannot overlook the great forces which have been set in motion in this country during the last 2 or 3 years insofar as the acres of land and the production of food and processing taxes and N. R. A., and the trouble with railroads and our waterways and trucks and overland transportation are concerned.

In looking through this report I find, as has been stated, some \$105,000,000 devoted to providing water for hungry acres through the P. W. A. Certain products are being produced in those irrigated valleys which are highly competitive with the crops being grown in Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, and other States east of the Mississippi. I have the greatest respect anyone could have for the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR]. He made the statement yesterday afternoon:

Our principal crops compete scarcely at all with the farm crops of any other parts of our country. Our range cattle and sheep and our sugar beets and alfalfa do not at all affect the farmers of the rest of the country any more than the cotton and tobacco of the South affect us.

The remarks which I intend to make have to do with something that Colorado perhaps is interested in more than in any other crop grown there, and that is the production of sugar. In the Western States there are something like 8 to 12 million bags of sugar produced for which there is no home market in the territory where the sugar is consumed. That sugar moves into Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee, to the great detriment of the beet growers in the Western States and of the growers in Michigan, Ohio, and Indiana, and to the people of this country who now pay processing taxes in order to provide for parity payments. That excess sugar is largely dumped into the eastern territory on a special rebate basis to the tune of millions and millions and millions of dollars' worth, and is tending to crucify not only the beet growers in these western valleys where this money is used to provide water, but to do likewise to the growers in the Eastern States.

If it were not for the farmers and the Government and the triple A and the consumers interested in processing taxes and benefit payments and parity payments, these remarks would not be in order. However, this money is appropriated to provide water to increase production per acre. At Toledo, Ohio, there are 2,000 farmers begging for the privilege of growing 20,000 acres of beets on farms that have been highly developed and that require P. W. A. funds or general appropriations to provide water. At Owosso, Mich., there are 2,000 farmers who are asking for 20,000 acres possibly. At Croswell, Mich., are another thousand who are begging for another 10,000 acres of beets. Those farmers are being denied the right to grow those acres of beets and provide sugar that would move in markets 50 to 100 miles from the point of production, while here we spent \$105,000,000 in western valleys to provide water for increased production so that sugar from that production may move into eastern territory to be distributed largely through the two big chain stores, and on a secret rebate and special-price basis which helps to crucify the little independent

retail stores who feed the people when they are not able to pay cash for the time being, which the chain stores will not do.

This question of providing more water so that more crops can be produced is related to the restriction of acres and production of food products, and is related to the fact that millions of box cars flow from East to West loaded and must come back, and those very box cars seek tons of freight moving east at a rate entirely out of line with rates charged in eastern territory, and that forces the farmers and the shippers in the eastern territory to pay a freight rate unreasonably high when compared to the low freight cost on the long-haul concentrated farm products moving eastward from far-away western fields. If the rails make an unreasonably low rate eastward and thereby incur a loss on the haul, the eastern farmers' rates are raised to help make up the loss of the railroads on the long haul from the West. There is no consistency in such a program. It is unfair to the farmers in the East and unfair to the farmers in the West. These new artificial forces which have been put to work by the A. A. A. and the P. W. A. and the N. R. A. with increasing costs and retirement of acreage, and allocation of production, and consolidation of transportation agencies, makes it necessary for us to debate these matters to the end that we may think more clearly on the problem as a whole. The farmers of the West are as vitally interested as those of the East. It all has to do with production and control thereof. We have coming up in a few days the bill H. R. 5585.

It has to do with parity prices and payments of processing taxes. Mr. Chester Davis only yesterday morning submitted testimony which ties in to the very problem of further providing more water, not for more acres but for more production on the acres which are to be cultivated. For instance, when we refer to pages 107 and 110 of the report, we find Dr. Mead making statements like this:

The money for these reservoirs has been allotted. We are building three of them and have prepared plans for the fourth.

Our distinguished chairman said a few moments ago that he did not know what would happen under the works program, if it goes through. Suppose they take a hundred million dollars of the public-works money, or five hundred million, or eight hundred million, and go out there and build new reservoirs and impound more water and raise more crops. I know what it means when those mountains are without snow. I know what it means when those reservoirs are without water, and I know what it means when they approach the spring planting time. I know the discouragement that exists when snow is not on the mountains on the 1st of April and when the reservoirs have been emptied by the water having been used at the end of the previous year.

On the other hand, I know the joy that runs through the life of those people when the mountains are covered with snow and the reservoirs are full of water and when those wonderful crops are growing on the irrigated lands. It is a question of so-called "overproduction." I think it is underconsumption, but they call it "overproduction." It is a question of the Government stepping in and saying, "You cannot produce on your land the things that that land will produce." It is a question of handing over \$4,800,000,000 to be dished out under the pressure of this particular group or that particular group or some other group. It is a question of the East conflicting with the West, the West conflicting with the South. It is a question of railroads without proper revenue and without compensatory rates.

Dr. Mead, speaking further, said this:

Federal irrigation today is largely a rescue agency.

We have so many rescue agencies today that they are all in conflict. They are running at counter purposes. Certainly it is a rescue agency, but providing a crop that Michigan, Ohio, and Indiana farmers can raise is a rescue agency for the eastern farmer just the same as this money is a rescue agency in providing water for the western irrigationist. Dr. Mead thinks in terms of rescuing his irrigationists and I think in terms of my farmers first and the

whole country secondly. I am not speaking against the production of sugar in this country. We are producing only 26 percent in continental United States of what we consume. We are importing 74 percent, and the principal part of it comes from the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and from Hawaii. A great part comes from Cuba, but the farmers in Michigan, Indiana, and Ohio, where many mills now stand, want the privilege of growing sugar beets to the capacity of those mills, and they should not be denied that right. They want to grow them because those sugar beets are at the point of consumption. They are not 1,500 miles away from a consuming market. They do not need P. W. A. funds to provide water for the growing of the beets.

You cannot grow bulk crops in the mountain valleys and ship them East to points of consumption without a loss. Those shipments have to be concentrated products. What do I mean by "concentrated products"? I mean beef on the hoof. I mean sugar in the bag. Hay grown out there is consumed on the spot. The beet tops are consumed on the spot. The dried beet pulp or the wet pulp is consumed on the spot. It is not put into cars and shipped eastward; while in the East the beet tops and the sugar and the beef is consumed. You say, "Are you going to cut those people off from living?" No. The new forces would take those people bodily and drag them off to other points in the United States. We all know the "planned economy" program calls for great shifts of our population, for the retirement of marginal lands, for the breaking up of homes. It is all so very far-reaching that we should very seriously consider the whole plan before starting to pull up stakes.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE. What would you do now? Hay is being loaded in Oregon to feed you people back there right now.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I had my way about it I would produce to the limit in farms and in factories. I would ship that surplus product to the rest of the world at any price at which the starving millions would buy it. I would produce all I could in western Colorado and in these other States, and I would produce it in the Eastern States. In other words, I believe in the economy of abundance and not in the economy of scarcity.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Where did the gentleman live in Colorado?

Mr. CRAWFORD. At Denver.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. How long did the gentleman live there?

Mr. CRAWFORD. For several months.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Several months.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. How long since the gentleman has been there?

Mr. CRAWFORD. It has been about 9 years.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. The gentleman's idea is that in order to relieve a condition in Michigan he would like to have the greatest industry in Colorado—namely, the sugar-beet industry—suspend operation? Do I understand the gentleman correctly?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No, sir; not at all. I call attention to H. R. 5585. If you will take that and analyze it, and if you will analyze the statements of Mr. Davis before the Committee on Agriculture made this very week, the gentleman will find exactly what I am driving at.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Just what is the gentleman's suggestion?

Mr. CRAWFORD. My suggestion is that until this restriction program is over with, we discontinue appropriating funds for the purpose of the production of concentrated food products in the western territory while at the same time we are denying the eastern farmers the right to operate farms which they have operated down through the years and which have been developed for 50 years, and which do not require the appropriations of \$105,000,000 or more mil-

lions to give water to the end that more crops may be produced when acreage is being retired.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. I would like to ask what appropriation for irrigation in Colorado the gentleman refers to?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am referring to the \$105,000,000.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Where is the \$105,000,000 in Colorado?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me clear the gentleman's mind on this, the products I am talking about are coming from Colorado, Utah, Montana, Wyoming, and California. They move down the coast, through the Panama Canal. They permeate this country through the Warrior and Mississippi Rivers. They go through the New York Barge Canal. They come in direct competition with the products produced in Michigan, Ohio, and those States contiguous.

If it is to be a planned economy, why not put those products where they will not crucify the other farmers of the United States?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, can he tell us how much according to his information has been granted for irrigation projects in Colorado?

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is not a question of localizing this to any little particular project.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. But the gentleman referred to Colorado.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I referred to Colorado because the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee stated that none of their crops came into direct competition with crops of the East.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Does not the gentleman know that the amount of sugar produced in the United States is far less than the amount consumed?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I so stated awhile ago.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. The gentleman has not yet answered my question as to how much money is spent for irrigation in Colorado, or how much is allocated for irrigation projects in Colorado under this bill or through any other governmental project.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I lived in Colorado once and even helped locate some of these irrigation projects.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Did the gentleman spend more than 5 months in Colorado?

Mr. CRAWFORD. It does not matter how long a person spent in a State if he is informed. The damage is being done in the Eastern States where the western product is being sold under special and secret rebates, thus destroying independent merchants and price structures on farm products.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. The gentleman has not answered my question. He said he knew something about Colorado. He said he lived there several months about 9 years ago. Some of us have lived there 30 or 40 years continuously and think we know something about our State. Our Colorado farmers who are producing sugar beets are raising them on lands which also have been developed for 5, 10, 15, 20, and 50 years. All money now being spent for irrigation works in Colorado is to supplement existing water supply for lands now and for many years under cultivation and not to bring new acreage under cultivation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND].

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, the remark I made a few minutes ago when the gentleman from Colorado was addressing the Committee to the effect that from the questions asked it was apparent that many Members of the House had an erroneous conception of Alaska, to the extent of about 100 percent, was not intended as a reflection on anyone, for a man may travel through Alaska under certain conditions and circumstances and when he comes out, although he has exercised ordinary intelligence while he was there, he would not know much more about Alaska than he did before he went in. The implication behind the

question seemed to have been that we would be better off if we gave Alaska back to Russia or turned it over to China or simply gave it its independence; that the country as a whole would be farther ahead if Alaska were not a part of the United States.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. If the gentleman will permit an observation, he ought not to feel so very lonesome, because the inference from much of what has been said on the floor on the bill against reclamation seems to be that the entire western United States ought to be ceded back to France and Mexico, that it is not worth anything, that it is a national liability, and we ought to wish it off on the people we bought it from.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield.

Mr. BOYLAN. The gentleman made the statement that a man could travel Alaska from one end to the other and not know anything about it. I do not quite understand it. Will the gentleman explain his statement?

Mr. DIMOND. My time, of course, is limited, but I may explain it this way: A man could go from the banquet of one chamber of commerce to the banquet of another in Alaska and really not know very much about the Territory; whereas another man, like the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], would really see the country and understand what he saw not only of Alaska as Alaska but of Alaska as a part of the United States.

The statement was made a moment ago—and I want to correct it—that there are some 18,000 or 19,000 white people in Alaska. It is not quite as bad as that. The white population of Alaska is something in excess of 29,000. One very encouraging thing about the last report of the collector of customs for Alaska was that it showed an increase in the population of Alaska last year by 1,100 people, by immigration alone. This is the greatest increase in immigration in any one year we have had since the World War. We used to have plenty more people in Alaska, as the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] said. We had 100,000 white people in Alaska at one time, but a number of circumstances dragged the number down. One was the conservation policy of the Government, and I am not saying anything against it, but it had a very direct bearing on population. In 1906 this Government entered upon a new policy with relation to its public lands and a necessary effect of that policy was to some extent to tend to a depopulation of the Territory. Another thing that had a serious effect was the World War. Alaska provided more soldiers for the Army and more men for the Navy during the war in proportion to population, both white and native, than any other part of the United States; and that is not at all strange, because a large part of the population of Alaska at that time was made up of young and adventurous men; and as soon as war was declared they did not stop and wait to be drafted; they did not enlist in Alaska because they were afraid the war would be over before they got into it, but these men went to the other States, and New York, Maryland, and other States got the credit for the enlistment of many of Alaska's men, young men who were the very lifeblood of that Territory and necessary for its economic expansion. After their experiences in the war they did not come back. We are now, however, on the upgrade.

It is said Alaska does not amount to anything economically? I have in my hand the report of the Commission to study the proposed highway to Alaska, acting under an act of Congress. In order to show the justification for this great project the Commission says this—and I hope it will be given such weight as it is entitled to:

The study of population alone does not give a true picture of the commercial and industrial importance of the Territory, especially during the intensive mechanization that has characterized gold-producing and fishing industries in recent years, resulting in the general use of machines to replace manpower. In normal years the average value of merchandise shipped to Alaska is from \$30,000,000 to \$40,000,000 and exports, including gold and silver, from \$50,000,000 to \$60,000,000, giving a substantial balance

of trade in favor of the Territory. From these figures, taken from the Government reports, it is seen that there are produced each year and exported from Alaska commodities to the value of from \$800 to \$1,300 for every man, woman, and child permanently residing in the Territory. If the United States as a whole could produce at the same rate per capita, we would have the enormous exportable surplus of over \$100,000,000,000 per year.

Mr. Chairman, that is not millions of dollars: It is \$109,000,000,000 that would be produced by the United States if the United States, in proportion to population, produced as much as Alaska.

The most important products of Alaska, of course, are gold and copper and fish. You may ask, why is there not greater wealth in Alaska now, and why are there not more white people residing permanently in Alaska? I have said before on this floor and I repeat that the trouble with Alaska at the present time is what was formerly called in Europe "absentee landlordism." The people who own the greater part of the wealth of Alaska or who take to themselves the greater part of the wealth of Alaska, and they take it partly by reason of investment of capital and energy and partly by something not so commendable, live not in Alaska, but in the United States; so that all of the vast wealth produced in Alaska in the past and all of the vast wealth reserved for future years has gone and will go under the present set-up, not to residents of Alaska, but to people who live in the United States, and those people are spread all over the United States. We have a great copper mine in Alaska—

Mr. SIROVICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SIROVICH. Is it not a fact that four organizations like the California Packers, the Alaska Packers, Libby, McNeil & Libby, and the A. & P. Co. through traps which they have in Alaska take away about 55 percent of the salmon caught up there every year?

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, I am not able to give the exact figures to the gentleman, but I believe his statement is substantially correct.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. On the question of wealth produced, how much of it is fish?

Mr. DIMOND. Half of it or probably more than half.

Mr. MICHENER. The people who produce that do not live there. They go up there in boats, get what they want, and come away.

Mr. SIROVICH. And do not even employ the natives.

Mr. DIMOND. I am coming to fish by and by.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan referred to the Alaskan Railroad, and I want to touch upon that before I take up the fishing question. It has been intimated or suggested that outside of fishing we have not anything in the Territory. That is not correct. Alaska has produced in the past between \$400,000,000 and \$500,000,000 in gold alone, and judging by the present outlook—judging by the prospects we have and the knowledge of gold-bearing ground we have to some extent developed—Alaska will produce in the next 50 years at least \$500,000,000 more in gold.

We may leave out of consideration for the present the tin, nickel, copper, and the other minerals of Alaska. Its coal alone is almost exhaustless. Leaving all that out of consideration, the gold alone of Alaska has justified the expenditure of every dollar that has been spent there. Expenditures of the Government have been justified by the gold production in the past, and doubly so by what we know it is going to produce in gold in the future. Of course, the Territory lately has been aided by the gold policy of the administration in increasing the price of gold from \$20.67 to \$35 an ounce. This permits greater profit from known gold-bearing bodies, and it also permits the working of what we used to call the low-grade ground. As you may understand, we have vast areas that could not be mined when gold was \$20.67 per ounce, but may be mined at a substantial profit at \$35 an ounce. That is one of the reasons why our population has increased 1,100 through immigration in the past year. The

people are going into the gold regions. Now, I hope that 10,000 people will not go to Alaska expecting to find employment in the gold mines. A certain limited number can obtain work, as there is bound to be an increase in employment along this line, but not many.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MEAD in the chair). All time has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to continue for an additional 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inform the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] that the time for general debate has been fixed by the House. The Chair may suggest that the gentleman can move to strike out the last word when the first paragraph of the bill is read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, namely:

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, some question has arisen about the Alaskan Railroad, and evidently it is thought that we should abandon the railroad in that it is economically a failure. May I say that as compared with the transcontinental railroads in the United States, the Alaskan Railroad even at this time is an outstanding success. Remember that when the transcontinental railroads were built thousands and thousands of acres of land lying along the rights-of-way of the railroads were given to the railroad companies, land that at the present time is worth probably in excess of a billion dollars. We must remember, too, that not one of these railroads has continued in life until the present time without a loss to the investors in each of them totaling hundreds of millions of dollars, through failures, bankruptcies, if bankruptcy applies to them, and receiverships and reorganizations. We had an example not long ago in the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad, and I suppose it would not be an exaggeration to say that the losses to the stockholders and bondholders of actual money invested in that railroad would be in excess of \$100,000,000. It may be said that, after all, the Government was not involved in this, and that this money came out of the pockets of the investors or the people who bought stock in these corporations. This is true, but where does the Government get its money except from the taxes of the people?

Therefore, even though the Alaskan Railroad has cost \$71,000,000, and even though you are about to appropriate, I assume, \$250,000 to cover its deficit for the coming year, as compared with the other railroads, with all their reorganization and graft and receivership and losses of hundreds of millions of dollars to the people, I say again that the Alaska Railroad is the outstanding success in continental railroad building in these United States.

Let us also look to the future. Do not let us keep our eyes glued to just the square of ground ahead of us. Let us look to the future, and judging from what Alaska has done in the past, in the future it is going to be the most valuable asset of the United States, bar none.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. Yes; I yield gladly to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am sure every Member of the House present appreciates the gentleman's interesting and informative address. I am wondering if the gentleman would care to discuss the proposal to build a highway from the United States to Alaska, and state whether he thinks this would help the situation economically and otherwise in Alaska.

Mr. DIMOND. I shall be pleased to do that, Mr. Chairman, and I am glad the gentleman from Oklahoma has called my attention to it.

About twelve hundred miles intervene between the northernmost point of the road system of Canada and the road system of Alaska, the Richardson Highway, to which I am now pointing. If this could be connected up, and I am pointing now to about the place to which the road is built, at Hazelton, British Columbia, by going through British Columbia, through the Yukon Territory, and through the city of Dawson, and then west to the Richardson Highway, a little south of Fairbanks, Alaska would be really made accessible to the people of the United States to an extent which is not possible at the present time. After all, the old covered-wagon spirit has not entirely disappeared from our people here, except instead of traveling by horses and mules and oxen they now go by automobiles.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As I understand, the major part of the proposed highway would be in Canada, would it not?

Mr. DIMOND. That is quite true, five-sixths of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Has the gentleman any information that he could give the Members as to whether or not the Canadian Government is sufficiently interested in the proposal to build its share of this highway?

Mr. DIMOND. In answer to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, I may say that the Canadian Government has shown an interest in it in the past. Of course, the people of Canada and the governments of Canada, both Dominion and Provincial, are like our own governments—they have not had any too much money in recent years. However, I believe this can be taken care of.

On my way from Alaska to Washington last October I had quite an extended conversation with the Premier of British Columbia, Mr. Pattullo, on the subject, and he said, "We want the road, but what are we going to use for money at the present time? It is true we need this road, but we need other roads in British Columbia."

Of course, other roads are needed in Canada.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. Yes; surely.

Mr. HOEPEL. It is my opinion, after having lived in Alaska for 10 years, it would be more desirable that we develop Alaska itself and build roads throughout Alaska rather than build a road from Alaska through British territory to Seattle. What does the gentleman think about that?

Mr. DIMOND. No; I think the two ought to go hand in hand. It is true we need more roads in Alaska, and the Alaska Road Commission, which is the Government road-building agency in Alaska, under the Department of the Interior, has set up a program for the expenditure in Alaska at various places, as an extension of its road system, of about \$6,000,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. This includes \$2,000,000 called for to construct the Alaska end of what is known as the "International Highway" or the "Pacific-Yukon Highway."

I must disagree with my distinguished friend from California. I think the most important thing in the development of Alaska would be the construction of this international highway, and I am happy to know that 3 or 4 days ago the Senate passed a bill calling for the construction of the highway, or looking toward the construction of the highway, which was introduced in the Senate by Senator McNARY, of Oregon. I have a similar bill in the House. I hope this legislation will be enacted at the present session. It is worthy of the support of every Member.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. If I understand the gentleman correctly, what he means to tell the House is that what you need in Alaska is people rather than capital.

Mr. DIMOND. Precisely.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. Certainly.

Mr. COLDEN. May I ask the gentleman how many months this proposed highway would be open for travel?

Mr. DIMOND. It could be kept open the year round, but it would not be economically wise to do so at first. It can be kept open at very slight expense for 6 months of the year. My friend Slim Williams went over the route two or three winters ago and he said that on this route he never got above timber line and never encountered more than 20 inches of snow. If the road followed the coast, of course, it could not be kept open for anything like that length of time, but as planned it goes back of the Coast Range in the series of valleys that extend southward from Alaska down to Mexico, east of the Coast Range.

Mr. COLDEN. May I ask the gentleman to what extent the lands of Alaska are suitable for homesteading and farming and in what part of Alaska these lands are situated?

Mr. DIMOND. The total area of Alaska is about 350,000,000 acres. A little over 1 percent is covered with ice. The agricultural land in Alaska, as classified by the Bureau of the Census, is 40,000,000 acres. It could easily support a population on the farming lands alone of two or three million, judging by what has been accomplished in Norway, Sweden, and Finland.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Judging by what has been accomplished in Alaska in the way of experimentation by the Department of Agriculture, how many would it support?

Mr. DIMOND. The same number. The gentleman has intimated—I forget his exact language—that Alaska is not suitable for the growth of any crops or produce, but as the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] has said, when we have sunlight for 18 or 20 hours a day our growing season is extended that much longer. Between the 20th of May and the 20th of September we have more sunlight daily in Alaska than you have in Michigan or Oklahoma, and of course, if you have that much more sunlight and maintain the same warm temperature the growing season is that much longer. We grow some of the finest vegetables in the world in Alaska. Dr. Steffanson says that the finest celery in the world is grown at Dawson.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. The gentleman says there are 300,000,000 acres of land in Alaska.

Mr. DIMOND. There are 350,000,000 acres of land in Alaska.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. About how many square miles is that?

Mr. DIMOND. Five hundred and ninety thousand square miles. I have a pamphlet here which I think will interest you. It states that the area of Alaska exceeds that of the Thirteen Original States plus Vermont, Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois.

Of course, a good deal of it is tundra and only fit for the support of reindeer, but we have 40,000,000 acres of agricultural land.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. About what is the mean temperature?

Mr. DIMOND. The temperature of the water is about 41 degrees, as the Japan current runs along the whole coast of Alaska and moderates the temperature, just as the Gulf Stream does in Norway.

Now, gold is not the only mineral that is produced in Alaska. The copper mines have produced \$200,000,000 worth of copper, but, owing to the fall in prices by the failure of industry to absorb the copper, the production has fallen off, and now all copper mines in Alaska are closed.

Now, the issue was raised this morning by a question to the gentleman from Colorado as to the importation of people into that Territory to be employed in the fishing industry. That is quite correct.

That is quite correct, and what Mr. TAYLOR said about that is correct. That is one of the troubles with Alaska. If you turn control of the fisheries over to the people of Alaska, to be administered by the Alaska Legislature, the Government here would save two or three hundred thousand dollars that it appropriates every year in order to supervise the fisheries, and we in Alaska would be infinitely better off. Thousands upon thousands of Filipinos and orientals of various kinds are brought into Alaska every year. They do very materially displace the local labor, including the natives, who, I think, ought to be given first call when it comes to employment. That arises from the fact that the fishing companies are largely owned in the United States. It is "absentee landlordism" again. These companies will not take the trouble—they will not make sufficient effort—to employ residents of Alaska, but give preference in employment to people in the United States. That lessens unemployment to that extent in the United States, but in the long run the coast States as well as Alaska will be better off if we had our residents fully employed in the industry and had local control of the fisheries. Just now we are not getting the benefits that we ought to have out of the fisheries.

Another thing this Congress may do, even if it did not give control of the fisheries to the people of Alaska, which would help us Alaskans very materially with respect to fisheries, would be to abolish all fish traps and give the man of small capital who can buy a small boat and a seine a chance to make a living out of the fisheries. As it is now, the big traps catch so much fish that the fishermen of Alaska have not a fair opportunity to make a living out of this industry.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. Yes; gladly.

Mr. MOTT. Is it by reason of the fact that Alaska is a Territory that it is not able to control the fisheries, with regard to employment?

Mr. DIMOND. Precisely. When the organic act was passed for Alaska, as first drafted it contained a provision whereby the Territory could control its fisheries. That provision was lost either in committee or in the House, and nobody has been able since to get any bill even out of committee looking to Territorial control of the fisheries.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. Yes.

Mr. SIROVICH. The gentleman knows how I sympathize with him personally regarding the three or four hundred traps operated by two or three men that catch 55 percent of the fish in Alaska. I introduced a bill before our committee to abolish the traps which would help the natives of Alaska, and still the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Roper, is opposed to the bill. Can the gentleman tell me whether the Alaska people are in sympathy with the bill that I have introduced?

Mr. DIMOND. I can assure the gentleman that the people of Alaska, in my opinion, are 99 percent in sympathy with the object of the bill and with his exact bill. I have received I do not know how many dozen letters from Alaska since the bill was introduced, and in all but one there was no objection to the bill, and the hope was expressed that the bill would be enacted at this session of Congress.

Mr. SIROVICH. Why is the Secretary of Commerce opposed to the bill?

Mr. DIMOND. Of course, I cannot tell that.

Mr. SIROVICH. What is the gentleman's opinion? He represents a great Territory and has a right to express his opinion.

Mr. DIMOND. The packers say that if this bill passes they will be ruined. I know that they will not be ruined.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the Delegate from Alaska has again expired.

Mr. LORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has not commented yet about the coal fields of Alaska. I ask the gentleman be given 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the Delegate from Alaska be granted 10 minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, to use a moving-picture term, I feel that I am "hogging the camera." I would not have brass enough myself to ask for any more time, but I do thank the gentleman from New York for making the request. Before I conclude with traps, let me say this: It is pretty hard to describe them unless I use technical terms, but they consist of piles driven into the ground or of nets suspended from framework on the water. When the salmon come to the traps they go in by the thousands, and sometimes by the hundreds of thousands. If these traps could be done away with, the fish could be caught by the local fishermen, and just as cheaply in the long run after they are organized for it, as they can be caught by the traps.

But there is an objection that has been made to me, but not published, I think, by the packers. They say, privately, at least, that if they had to depend upon the fishermen to catch the fish with seines or gill nets, they might be met with strikes in the middle of a season and thereby everyone would be ruined. Of course one can understand that result would be accomplished by a strike in midseason because the salmon run is just a few weeks; and if you stop fishing for a week or two in the middle of the season, the packers and the fishermen also are ruined. But I think there is a complete answer to that: In Bristol Bay we have the greatest red-salmon region in the world—and I may interpolate here to say that Alaska is the greatest salmon country in the world and produces five-eighths of all the salmon consumed in the world. In Bristol Bay we have not had a trap for a good many years, nor has there been a strike there, in or out of the season, for at least 30 years, so I believe that these packers who say they may be confronted with strikes are consumed by fears and there is no real ground for danger on that point.

Mr. CROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield.

Mr. CROWE. Does the gentleman know the tax that these fisheries pay to the Government of Alaska? Do they pay any substantial amount of taxes?

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, to answer the gentleman from Indiana, the fisheries pay about 80 percent of the taxes that come into the treasury of the Territory of Alaska, and they are not overtaxed. The fisheries of Alaska do not pay as much taxes as they would if they were operated in any State of the Union, yet they pay 80 percent of the Territorial taxes, because the Territorial tax, after all, amounts to only about a million dollars a year; and since the fisheries produce from thirty to fifty million dollars a year, it is, of course, entirely proper that they should pay a substantial portion of the tax.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Does the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska have jurisdiction over taxation? May it fix the tax that the fish packer must pay?

Mr. DIMOND. That is quite true. The legislature, theoretically probably, could tax the fish companies out of existence, but the people of Alaska do not have any such idea. They do not want to ruin anybody or confiscate anybody's property, and they purposely have kept the taxes as low as they could be kept within reason and yet supply the Territorial needs. That is another argument supporting my claim that the entire control of the fisheries should be turned over to the people of Alaska. By past experience they have justified the confidence which they ask of Congress in them not to destroy anybody if they have control of the fisheries.

Mr. MOTT. Why is it that under the organic law the Legislature of Alaska can fix the tax to be charged the packers of fish and still they have no control over the regulation of the fisheries? Is that provided in the organic law?

Mr. DIMOND. Yes; it is provided in the organic law that the legislature can tax, but it has no control over the fisheries.

Mr. MOTT. I think Alaska ought to have control over its own fisheries.

Mr. DIMOND. I apologize to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lord] for not having taken up the coal matter, but I am so engrossed in fisheries that I sometimes forget other matters.

Alaska has, to my personal knowledge, since I was a prospector for a good many years, a vast body of coal scattered all over the Territory. I was a prospector for a great many years, and during that time I prospected on a river called the "Chitylahina", or, as the white man would say, "Chittystone River." There was a coal bed that I know of personally in the side of that mountain 20 feet thick that ran a distance of 10 miles and then showed up in another valley 10 miles away. We used some of the coal for black-smithing purposes. Up in the Matanuska Valley there are bodies of coal that are practically inexhaustible. It was said this morning that they have to manicure or launder the coal in order to use it. That is not a fact. Some of the coal is washed in order to make it better coal and more usable. Of course, the idea that they cannot use this coal on the Alaska Railroad to operate the engines is certainly not correct, because it is and has been used. Coal all along the railroad is used to operate it.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. Surely.

Mr. MICHENER. What I was referring to was that the coal that was shipped in on the engines could not be used because you could not use that coal with a draft. The disheartening thing about it was that the coal comes out of the side of the hill and then they had to haul it down on the railroad 4 or 5 miles to the river before they could bathe it. The coal and the water are not together. It cost \$14 a ton at that time when they got through laundering it.

Mr. DIMOND. In answer to the gentleman, the railroad now pays, as I recall, \$3.65 a ton for this coal, and the wages of miners now are something around \$8 a day. There is ample coal, washed and unwashed, to supply not only Alaska but, if it were considered economically justifiable, to supply all the people of the United States for the next three or four hundred years. There is plenty of coal in Alaska.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman tell us the variety of minerals that Alaska possesses?

Mr. DIMOND. Yes. The only minerals we have produced in any quantity are gold and copper. Tin has been found. It is not worked. Nickel has been found. It is not worked. Lead, of course, you cannot give away. There are whole mountains of hematite in some parts of Alaska where I have been, but nobody wants it. Ultimately it will be valuable. It will be particularly valuable to a nation, like Japan, that is without these minerals.

Mr. SIROVICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield.

Mr. SIROVICH. After listening to the interesting and instructing remarks made by the gentleman from Alaska referring to these natural resources, mineral resources, fishing, whaling, and sealing, what fortifications have we in Alaska to protect us from Japan's coming over to the Aleutian Islands and taking Alaska during a run of the salmon?

Mr. DIMOND. I wish to show to you on this map, which is the great circle of the North Pacific Ocean. First, I will answer the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIROVICH] and say that we have about 150 infantrymen armed with rifles down in the southeastern part of Alaska at Fort William H. Seward, and no other defensive works whatsoever. We have 150 infantrymen there. In all this vast body of Alaska and the Aleutian Islands we have not a man or a gun or a cannon or a soldier or a marine or anything else. On this map I point to Tokyo and Yokohama. The short route to the United States is as I indicate on

this map. Even if Alaska were a desert, the people of the United States would be absolutely foolish not to fortify and defend it, because this is the short cut on which you will have to meet an attack if it ever comes across the Pacific to the continental United States.

Here are the Hawaiian Islands. What man would be dumb enough to go first to the Hawaiian Islands from Japan and then north to Alaska, when the direct route is so much shorter?

Mr. SIROVICH. A hop could be made from Japan to the Aleutian Islands in a day. The islands could be fortified; and airplanes starting at the Aleutian Islands could reach and bombard Washington, Oregon, or California within 6 hours. Is that right?

Mr. DIMOND. Of course; there is no question about it.

Mr. SIROVICH. The Aleutian Islands could be used as a submarine base whence ships could go and destroy Panama and the Canal.

Mr. DIMOND. We ought to have a big naval base in the Aleutian Islands, but that cannot be established until December 31, 1936, without violating the provisions of the naval-limitations treaty, because under this treaty, in the interest of peace, we gave away our right to fortify the Aleutians until December 31, 1936; but we can establish an air base in the interior of Alaska which would effectively control the water and protect our own Pacific coast. But do not be deceived into thinking an enemy bound for the Aleutian Islands would first go to the Hawaiian Islands, for it is 1,400 miles farther. [Applause.] Look at the map. That is all I ask. May I refer to my remarks which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 20?

Mr. SIROVICH. And there are only 115 soldiers to defend Alaska!

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for this time to call the attention of the House to a resolution I am about to introduce and will immediately put in the basket providing and making available immediately \$880,000,000 the President says is absolutely necessary to take care of the emergency-relief operations until the 1st of July.

The adoption of this resolution will accomplish two purposes; first, it will provide the emergency relief the people of the country are so deeply interested in at this time and which seems necessary should be provided; and, secondly, it will give ample time to both branches of Congress to fully, comprehensively, and knowingly discuss and take up the major part of the \$5,000,000,000 relief bill. At the time that bill was before the House the consideration was not satisfactory to the Members on either side. We did not have full and complete opportunity to understand and know what we were doing.

As far as I am concerned personally, and as far as my colleagues on this side of the aisle are concerned, we did not oppose anything that was absolutely necessary to take care of the emergency-relief situation. We did feel, however, and do feel yet that \$4,000,000,000 was more money than could be expended judiciously during the next 2 years on public works and that there was serious doubt whether it would accomplish the desired end in the relief of unemployment; and we also did seriously oppose the extraordinary powers granted to the President in the various provisions of that bill.

I specially call the attention of the Members of the majority to this resolution. If they are really and honestly in earnest about meeting the relief situation, they should give this resolution immediate consideration. We are willing that it should be called up by unanimous consent, or even under suspension of the rules next Monday. Further, we will cooperate to that end. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
SALARIES

Salaries: For the Secretary of the Interior, Under Secretary (which position is hereby established in the Department of the Interior with compensation at the rate of \$10,000 per annum and with appointment thereto by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate), two Assistant Secretaries, and other personal services in the District of Columbia, \$431,590: *Provided*, That in expending appropriations or portions of appropriations, contained in this act, for the payment for personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, with the exception of the Assistant Secretaries the average of the salaries of the total number of persons under any grade in any bureau, office, or other appropriation unit shall not at any time exceed the average of the compensation rates specified for the grade by such act, as amended, and in grades in which only one position is allocated the salary of such position shall not exceed the average of the compensation rates for the grade, except that in unusually meritorious cases of one position in a grade advances may be made to rates higher than the average of the compensation rates of the grade but not more often than once in any fiscal year and then only to the next higher rate: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not apply (1) to grades 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the clerical-mechanical service, or (2) to require the reduction in salary of any person whose compensation was fixed, as of July 1, 1924, in accordance with the rules of section 6 of such act, (3) to require the reduction in salary of any person who is transferred from one position to another position in the same or different grade in the same or a different bureau, office, or other appropriation unit, (4) to prevent the payment of a salary under any grade at a rate higher than the maximum rate of the grade when such higher rate is permitted by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and is specifically authorized by other law, or (5) to reduce the compensation of any person in a grade in which only one position is allocated.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing on page 2, lines 3 to 7, beginning with the words "Under Secretary" and including the language embodied in the brackets, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and, therefore, not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Colorado desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's point of order is well taken. This language does constitute legislation. I may say that the reason it was put in the bill is because it was recommended by the Budget, and it is a matter that comes up to the House regularly; approved by the administration and requested by the Department.

The Department of Agriculture, the Treasury Department, and the State Department each have an Under Secretary; and with the vast number of new activities that have been added to the Interior Department in the last 2 years, this Department is more entitled to an Under Secretary than any one of the other three that now have one. We thought that the justice of the situation and the eminent necessity of the case warranted the granting of the recommendation by the Budget and its approval by this committee, but I acknowledge that it is legislation and is subject to a point of order, and I will not defend it against that charge.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts insist upon his point of order?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I think the matter is of sufficient importance to come up in the regular way as a matter of legislation instead of being taken up in the course of the consideration of an appropriation bill. It involves not only the needs of this Department but a possible precedent for other departments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The language clearly is legislative in character. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Page 2, line 9, strike out "\$431,590" and insert in lieu thereof "\$421,590."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment explains itself. It merely takes out of the bill the \$10,000 which otherwise would be required for the salary of an Under Secretary if created at this time.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I think that is correct. If the office is not authorized, there is no need to make the appropriation for the salary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the establishment of a revolving fund for the purpose of making loans to Indian-chartered corporations, in accordance with the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat., p. 986), to be immediately available, \$2,500,000, of which amount not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, for purchase of equipment and supplies, and for other necessary expenses of administering such loans.

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AYERS: On page 24, line 1, strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,250,000."

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reduces the appropriation of \$2,500,000 for a revolving fund under the Wheeler-Howard bill to \$1,500,000. The purpose of this fund is to make loans to Indian-chartered corporations in accordance with the Wheeler-Howard Act. It is a part of a 100-percent experimental program put forth on the part of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. His whole program is to take the Indians of this country back 50 to 75 years and establish governments of every conceivable form and nature within the fundamental government of this Nation which the Indian has been taught to observe. The Commissioner's program is wheels within wheels and is not based on any theory of progress at all.

The Indian policy heretofore initiated by the Indian Department in this country sought to bring the Indian up to a standard of citizenship and responsibility whereby he would be self-sustaining by his own efforts. The first step in this direction was to educate him in the white schools with white children, so that he would have a complete opportunity to absorb white men's ways.

Under the act of 1932 the boarding schools and the day schools on the Indian reservations of this country were abandoned as far as possible. It is the policy now and has been the policy of the Indian Department since then to put these Indian children into State district schools, all of which have been built, equipped, supported, and maintained by taxation of property and lands owned and taxable within the school district.

Now, here is the trouble: These State schools have taken and enrolled the Indian children of parents owning only their pro rata share of Indian reservation land or Indian allotment lands, none of which are subject to any tax whatever, and in many instances more than 50 percent of the Indian children in these schools come from this nonassessable, non-taxable land, and at the same time the Government is not paying one single solitary penny for the school building, the equipment therein, or the upkeep thereof. One county in my district has 4 school districts affected this way, 2 of which also have high schools. All of the equipment in the high-school laboratories and all the manual-training equipment is furnished by the taxpayers of that district, and the Government does not pay a thing for its wards' use of these laboratories and equipment, and I may say that the Government wards in these schools equal more than 50 percent of the attendance. This condition applies not only to my State and my district but it applies in other States, such as North Dakota, South Dakota, Oregon, Washington, and the other Western States where Indians reside. These schools are overcrowded. The buildings were not built with the idea in mind that they were to take care of the Indian population; that has been handed to them since and by the Indian Bureau. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs a few days ago—I think the 12th of this month—testified before the Subcommittee on Appropriations that the Indian children were getting along fine in these schools; but he refused to go to the Bureau of the Budget and ask for a single solitary penny except to pay

a little tuition, the average of which he admitted to be about 40 cents a day, which includes bus transportation and a noonday meal in each instance to be furnished to these Indian children. This tuition, intended only for overhead, does not take care of the cost for which it is paid; it does not take care of the necessary extra teachers, janitors, bus expense, and noon meals, let alone additional buildings, equipment, and the maintenance of the buildings and equipment. And, mind you, the individual taxpayers of the districts are paying these bills.

It was reported to the committee, and I think this came from the Indian Bureau—at least it had the earmarks of having come from the Indian Bureau—that the annual average cost for each child taught in an Indian school was about \$290 per annum. The same report showed that in the State schools the average annual cost for Indian children was about \$70. The difference is made up by the individual taxpayers in these districts. Bear in mind there is not an acre of Indian land taxed to support these schools. There was not and there is not an assessment or a tax imposed upon the Indian land to build the school or to maintain them. In addition to all this the Indian Bureau is now trying to abandon, if you please, all the boarding schools in the various States. They are trying to abandon the Indian boarding schools and Indian day schools and put all the children on the individual taxpayers of these various States.

Mr. STEFAN. May I ask the gentleman if he has any abandoned schools in his district?

Mr. AYERS. Lots of them. They are all abandoned but two.

Mr. STEFAN. What has become of them?

Mr. AYERS. They are putting the children in white schools.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREENWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYERS. I yield to the lady from Arizona.

Mrs. GREENWAY. Has the gentleman this particular report in his hand?

Mr. AYERS. I have not.

Mrs. GREENWAY. The interesting part of the report, which comes from the Bureau, is that with 102,440 Indian children between the ages of 6 and 18, only 76,264 are in any known school. Practically one-fourth of the Indian children, after two or three generations of attempts to educate and care for the Indians, are still out of school.

Mr. AYERS. According to that report there are something over 26,000 Indian children of school age not in any school at all. Am I correct?

Mrs. GREENWAY. Yes.

Mr. AYERS. I thank the lady for the information.

Mr. HOEPPEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYERS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOEPPEL. The gentleman stated he had fewer schools in his district now than heretofore. Has his district an increase in the number of saloons and booze joints like we have in other parts of the country?

Mr. AYERS. I will say to the gentleman that I am now directing attention to the proposed amendment which has to do with the educational status of Indian children.

My idea is to amend this particular paragraph and take from this proposed experimental revolving fund a million dollars and transfer it to educational purposes. The experimental revolving fund, which is to be administered by the bureaucratic theorists, is now fixed at \$2,500,000. I think we can well reduce that by a million, and that amount would go a long way toward Indian education and help to reduce some of the impositions the Indian Bureau is now placing on the public schools in the places affected.

Mr. WERNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYERS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. WERNER. Could not the entire amount be stricken from the bill and no one injured one iota?

Mr. AYERS. I would not cry if all the proposed appropriations having to do with the Wheeler-Howard bill were stricken. The attempted administration of that bill by the Indian Bureau has aborted the bill's purpose.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman's bill provide for the reopening of the schools that are now empty and deteriorating?

Mr. AYERS. No; I have no bill. My idea is to strike from this appropriation \$1,000,000 and give it to the Secretary of the Interior to help build additional school buildings and additions to present public-school buildings so that the Indian children who are now going to these public schools can continue to go there. It is not the policy of the people in the States having Indian children to segregate or put these Indian children out of the public schools, but we have got to do it, because it has now reached the point where the Indians have multiplied and increased to the extent that these districts do not have the building facilities or the educational equipment to take care of them, unless we get help from the Government.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman add something to his bill in order to provide for again using some of these buildings on which we spent thousands of dollars that are now deteriorating?

Mr. AYERS. I cannot add legislation to an appropriation bill. I am only asking for relief, in this appropriation measure, by making this transfer of funds.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOILEAU. Would it not be advisable to have the Secretary of the Interior authorized to pay a larger amount for the support of the schools which the Indian children are now attending?

Mr. AYERS. No; I do not think that would bring about the desired results. I think we must build additional buildings in connection with these State schools to take care of the increased attendance by reason of transferring the Indian children to these schools. I think this is the best policy. According to what the Indian Bureau has stated, it wants to educate and build up the Indian children to the standard of the white children so they will be self-sustaining. This can be done by permitting them to go to these State schools; the experiment so far has been fine, but we cannot go further unless we get help in constructing additional buildings.

Mr. BOILEAU. Perhaps I misunderstood the gentleman. I understood him to say that many of the schools in his district were being closed.

Mr. AYERS. Yes; the Indian schools are closed and the Indian children are being put into State schools.

Mr. BOILEAU. Why not use those abandoned facilities for the education of these Indian children?

Mr. AYERS. We cannot do that in this bill, and it is not the policy of the Indian Bureau, and I do not believe it is the policy of Congress to do that. The policy of Congress, according to the bill of 1932, is to educate the Indian children in the lower grades, in the ordinary State schools wherever possible. Then when it comes to what we may call vocational training, they should be sent to such Indian schools as those that are located in the district of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Mott] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. WERNER], where, in each instance, an attempt is now being made by the Bureau to close those schools.

Mr. BOILEAU. If we made an appropriation here for the Secretary of the Interior to build new schools, they would not be Indian schools?

Mr. AYERS. Absolutely not. This is to aid the State schools where the Indian children are now being educated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 more minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. How does the gentleman's proposed amendment have anything to do with the matter he is now discussing?

Mr. AYERS. The proposal is that we take \$1,000,000 off of this revolving-fund appropriation on page 24 of the bill and put it over on page 39 in the item which provides for the education of Indian children, and authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use in cooperation with State schools. That would not bother the Budget in the least, nor would it disturb the footings of this bill one penny.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYERS. I yield to my friend from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman understands that the committee has taken a long step in the right direction by recommending in its report that the closing of nonreservation Indian boarding schools be discontinued.

Mr. AYERS. Yes; I appreciate that.

Mr. MOTT. And I congratulate the subcommittee on taking that step.

Mr. AYERS. And I congratulate them, too; but that does not help these State schools which are now overloaded with Indian pupils.

If you will look at page 39 of the bill, at which place I intend to offer another amendment for the use of this million dollars which I now propose to take from this revolving fund, you will find that in that instance the Oklahoma Indians are taken care of in the State schools of that State and appropriation therefor is made in this bill. Why not take care of the Indians in the other States as well as those in Oklahoma? I am sure that is the purpose of all of us.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Wherein does this bill propose to take care of the Indians in Oklahoma better than in other States?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am entirely in sympathy with some of the gentleman's remarks about his amendment, but I desire to place in the Record the testimony of Dr. Ryan, which will be found on page 868 of the hearings, a statement regarding the cost for the boarding school and the day-school for the Indians. He says:

The rate that we have for boarding schools is a very low rate for boarding-school education. It is between \$300 and \$350. That is entirely too low to operate a really effective institution, where all of the children board at school.

On the other hand, for from \$100 to \$125 per pupil, you can operate a remarkably good community school, with all of the facilities that there are on a day basis.

That is the information on which this appropriation is based. The bill carries an appropriation of two and a half million dollars to carry out the terms of the Wheeler-Howard Act, approved June 18, 1934.

Let me read this from the report:

Wheeler-Howard Act: The act of June 18, 1934, generally known as the "Wheeler-Howard Act", was designed to eventually place the Indians, of which there are approximately 327,000, on a self-supporting basis. This was to be accomplished by the making of loans.

There was authorized by the Budget, \$5,000,000, and the committee cut it down to \$2,500,000.

Mr. WERNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield.

Mr. WERNER. Do you not think that if this appropriation is cut to \$1,250,000 it would be sufficient to make the experiments that they wish to make?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Personally, I do not think it is practicable to further cut the appropriation. The Wheeler-Howard Act is the law, and the Budget Bureau has authorized \$5,000,000. The committee has cut it to \$2,500,000, and we believe that any further emasculation will defeat the purposes of the act.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I hesitate to make any statement concerning

any Member of the House or any member of my committee, but I want to call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Montana who offered the amendment is a member of the Indian Affairs Committee. He helped to write the Wheeler-Howard Act, worked for that act, voted for it, and the act passed almost unanimously.

The gentleman called attention to the fact that he would like to reduce the amount from \$2,500,000 to \$1,250,000. I should like to restore the sum in the bill to the amount carried in the Budget, which, as the gentleman from Nevada just said, is \$5,000,000.

The Indian reorganization act, known as the "Wheeler-Howard Act", authorized the establishment of a \$10,000,000 credit fund. This was reduced by the Budget to \$5,000,000. The only credit available to individual Indians or organization-group Indians is that provided by the Federal Government. Upon application of the organization it will be necessary to immediately provide financial aid in establishing industries from which Indians would derive income. This may be a tribal livestock organization, a tribal sawmill, or some other development operated by the tribe, or it may mean loans to individuals through the tribal-organization credit and by reason of the reorganization act. Five million dollars is little enough to be made available when we consider the large number of Indian tribes and individuals who will benefit through the use of this fund, but according to the bill we are making only \$2,500,000 available. Congress directed the fund to be established at \$10,000,000 and it was then felt the amount would not be adequate to meet all the needs.

The gentleman who offered this amendment acknowledged that he would like to strike out all of the appropriation to take care of the Wheeler-Howard Act. I am not defending that act, but I add to what the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] said, the Wheeler-Howard Act is now a law. If it is going to be operative, we have to have funds to make it effective. This reminds me of a few years ago when I was superintendent of schools. My board reelected me and asked me to recommend teachers. I came to one teacher I was uncertain about. I said, "Gentlemen, I am not going to recommend that you reemploy this teacher or that you discharge her. She has not cooperated very well. Perhaps it is partly my fault. You do as you please." They discussed the matter a while, and finally the president of the board said, "Gentlemen, I see no reason why we should hire Mr. ROGERS to run this school and then hire teachers to make it impossible for him to do it."

I see no reason why Congress should pass a law, even though some gentlemen do not believe in that law, and then make it impossible to make the law effective by refusing to appropriate funds with which to make it effective. The gentleman said he wants to take \$1,250,000 from this item and add it to the school item. I spent 15 years teaching school. I am just as much interested in schools as any man in this Congress; and I call attention to the fact that the Committee on Appropriations increased the amount to take care of schools by \$217,000.

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Not yet. I call attention to the fact that in this Interior appropriation bill the Committee on Appropriations of the House has cut the amount \$3,297,409, and of that amount \$3,150,000 is money that was approved by the Bureau of the Budget to put into effect the so-called "Wheeler-Howard Act." I hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Montana will not prevail.

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. AYERS. Will the gentleman point out to this House what item in the educational appropriations of this bill provides for the Indian children, who are up into the thousands, attending public schools, other than the tuition of an average of 40 cents a day throughout the country, which provides for one meal?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. I call attention to the fact that a number of schools that were not intended to be continued were continued under the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended 1 minute so that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Are the Oklahoma Indians exempted from the operations of the Wheeler-Howard bill?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. The Oklahoma Indians were exempted from the major provisions of that act.

Mr. PIERCE. Why?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Yesterday I introduced in the House, and Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma introduced in the Senate the day before, a bill known as the "Indian welfare bill" for the Indians of Oklahoma, and we hope to receive the benefits from the reorganization act by passing that bill.

Mr. PIERCE. I voted against the bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. There are provisions in that bill to which I am just as much opposed as the gentleman, and I shall cooperate with him in every way to correct the mistakes made when that bill was enacted, but since it is a law we are going to have to appropriate money to make it effective.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a statement concerning the Indian boarding schools.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, February 22, 1935.

Memorandum.

Submitted herewith is certain comparative information relative to Indian education:

TABLE I.—Indian education appropriations

	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936
Appropriation.....	\$10,185,400	\$9,771,000	\$9,103,230	\$7,990,565	\$8,771,120
Decrease.....		414,400	667,770	1,112,665	1,780,555

¹ Increase.

TABLE II.—School enrollment of Indian children

	1932	1933	1934
Nonresident boarding.....	14,266	12,504	9,276
Resident boarding.....	9,633	9,632	8,401
Total boarding.....	23,899	22,226	17,677
Day school.....	5,063	6,836	8,063
Mission.....	9,675	7,964	8,103
Public school.....	48,834	52,451	57,839
Grand total all schools.....	87,471	89,477	91,682

In table I it will be noted that a total of \$10,185,400 was appropriated in 1932 for Indian education purposes. During that year there was a total of 23,899 Indian children enrolled in boarding schools, and 53,897 children were enrolled in Federal day and public schools.

In 1934 the appropriation for Indian education had been decreased to \$9,103,230, or a decrease under 1932 of \$1,082,170. The enrollment in boarding schools for that year was reduced to 17,677. The enrollment in Federal day and public schools increased to 65,902.

Attention is called to the fact that while the reduction in boarding-school enrollment for 1934 under 1932 amounted to 6,222, we actually increased our enrollment in day and public schools by 12,005 thereby taking care of not only the boarding-school reduction but actually providing schooling for 5,783 additional children who had not previously been in school, and this was done on a decreased appropriation of \$1,082,170. If these 12,005 children had been taken care of on a boarding-school basis, it would have required an increase of \$3,901,625 over the actual appropriation of \$9,103,230 for 1934 instead of the decrease of \$1,082,170 from the 1932 figure.

Boarding-school reports for 1935 indicate an enrollment of 13,702 children at the middle of the year. This is a further reduction under 1934 of 3,875 children. Enrollment figures for Federal day and public schools are not as yet available but every effort

has been made to provide this type of school facilities for the 3,875 children mentioned above as being eliminated from the boarding schools this year. Continuing the comparisons between 1932 and 1934 to 1935 there is every indication that additional Indian children have been given educational opportunities this year and attention is also called to the fact that this is being done on a further reduction in appropriation in the amount of \$1,112,565 under the 1934 appropriation or a total reduction in appropriation from 1932 of \$2,194,835. It is clearly evident that the increased schooling facilities for Indian children could not have been provided with the decreased appropriation without the reduction in the costly boarding-school program.

It must be remembered that there are still some 12,000 to 15,000 Indian children for whom school facilities need to be provided. If all of these additional children were to be provided with boarding-school facilities approximately \$4,000,000 additional would be needed. If they were to be taken care of in Federal day and public schools \$1,500,000 would probably be sufficient.

The per-capita cost for various types of Indian schooling is shown below:

Boarding schools less than 200 enrollment.....	\$335
200 to 499 enrollment.....	305
500 or over.....	290
(\$50 additional per child is added for children above the sixth grade for special vocational training.)	
Federal day schools.....	135

Public school tuition average of 40 cents a day or \$72 a year per child.

I have not attempted any discussion of the desirability of Federal day- and public-school attendance as opposed to the boarding-school attendance, but have considered it only from the financial aspect. In addition to the day-school and public-school facilities being much less expensive than the boarding school, considerable could be added as to the desirability of the former as opposed to the latter; both from the standpoint of the home and community and society in general.

PAUL L. PICKINGER,
Assistant Director of Education (Administrative).

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Montana will not prevail. I feel that there is some sentiment throughout this country favorable to trying out the purposes of the Wheeler-Howard bill. It passed the House and Senate and it is intended to be a great humane step in the right direction in behalf of the Indians. The law authorizes \$10,000,000 for that purpose and the Budget cut it to \$5,000,000, and this subcommittee has cut it to \$2,500,000, only leaving one-quarter of what was authorized by law to be expended for this very purpose, I feel it would be entirely wrong for us to prevent the administration from trying to work out what they believe is a great and just step in the right direction for the Indians. I think we should at least give them that opportunity to try out the objects of the law.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman tell me in a few words just what is the object of the Wheeler-Howard bill? What are we trying to get at?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, that is too big a matter to discuss here. The Indian Affairs Committee put in nearly all of the Seventy-third Congress on it and were not satisfied with it then, and I understand that committee is considering repealing it now.

Mr. PIERCE. I think that is about as clear as it can be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. AYERS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pipestone, Minn.: For 250 pupils, \$82,000; for pay of superintendent, drayage, and general repairs and improvements, \$15,000; in all, \$97,000.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN: On page 36, line 11, after "\$97,000" and the semicolon, insert a new paragraph, as follows: "Genoa, Nebr.: For 400 pupils, including not more than \$400 for printing and issuing school paper, \$122,000; for pay of superintendent, drayage, and general repairs and improvements, \$17,650; in all, \$139,650."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, this part of the original bill is taken out at this time, and refers to a school located at Genoa, Nebr., in the Third Congressional District of Nebraska, a very fine school with wonderful buildings, cost-

ing considerable money, thousands of dollars. It was abandoned a year ago. It accommodated 400 pupils. The gentleman a little while ago made the statement that there are 26,000 Indian children of school age looking for a place to go to school and the white taxpayers have no money to appropriate for that tuition. We have spent thousands of dollars for these schools. They are wonderful buildings. They are abandoned and they are deteriorating. I believe the amendment should be passed and this school reopened for those school children who are roaming the country looking for a place for an education.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman realizes that the committee has been in session for about 3 weeks considering this bill. Did the gentleman ask permission to come before the committee and present his views on this matter at any time?

Mr. STEFAN. I did not, because I was not apprised that this matter was coming up; but I predict that your committee will some time recommend that these wonderful buildings which are deteriorating will be put back to use.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. But the gentleman did not appear before the committee in the interest of the school in question and did not ask that anything be done for his school during all these hearings.

Mr. STEFAN. No. I am a new Member of Congress, and I was not apprised that this question was coming up.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. Was that appropriation in the bill last year?

Mr. STEFAN. It was in the bill last year.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman had a perfect right to assume it would be carried in this appropriation bill. I wish to point out to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] that this bill has only been available for the last couple of days to Members of the House, and I assume that a Member has a right to believe that appropriations which have been in the bill year after year will be continued in the appropriation bill. So it is not the fault of the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. This item was not in the bill last year. I am a new member on the Appropriation Committee and I have no personal information on this item last year. As I understand, however, there was no appropriation made for this school last year and the school in question has been closed for more than a year.

Mr. STEFAN. I think the gentleman is right. The school has been closed for more than a year. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Permit me to say to the gentleman that last year there were five of these schools closed. There was no appropriation for them. This is one of those schools. Apparently there was no opposition at that time to the closing of five schools. They have since been abandoned and the children have been sent to other places. There is no more reason why we should restore this school than that we should restore the other four.

We doubted the wisdom of reducing those schools a year ago, but the tenor of the House was to do so, and they cut these out completely, and they have reduced many more on an average of 50 pupils each. We decided at this time to call a halt on that reduction of these nonreservation boarding schools. We have in this bill restored five or six or more that have been recommended to be abandoned or cut down. We restored one that was recommended to be abandoned. We have not restored the others, because I understand they are not objecting. They think the children have been amply taken care of outside. So that we are allowing several to be abandoned at this time for that reason.

Mr. STEFAN. It is a crime that these wonderful buildings are to be abandoned.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I sympathize with these people. There is one Indian school in my district on which

actually they have spent a million dollars for public buildings and they contemplate abandoning it. The Bureau may possibly be able to put some of those children in reservation day schools, but I doubt it. That school ought to be maintained.

While I sympathize with the gentleman, that is water gone over the wheel. We cannot go back now and reestablish all those schools that were abandoned a year ago. If we did, we would have to add to this bill hundreds of thousands and possibly millions of dollars. It is utterly impracticable now. All the equipment is removed and it could not be restored without enormous expense. These gentlemen had their day in court. The predecessor of the gentleman from Nebraska did not prevent that abandonment. All the Members of all the Western States have had an opportunity. I sent them all—Democrats and Republicans alike—a letter asking them to come before my committee in reference to any item of the bill in which any of them or their States were interested.

Mr. BOILEAU. May I say to the gentleman that my statement was based upon a misunderstanding on my part when I said that the item was carried in the bill last year?

Mr. WERNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I believe the gentleman from Colorado stated that these schools were abandoned last year without opposition on the part of the Members in whose districts the closed schools were located.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I do not remember that the gentleman from South Dakota appeared before my subcommittee on this matter.

Mr. WERNER. I made very strenuous objection to the closing of the schools, but the objection fell on deaf ears and we were flattened out as though we were flies in a road.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to call the attention of the House to the fact that it is a shame, nothing short of a crime, to waste public funds by the abandonment of these wonderful buildings and allowing them to deteriorate at a time when children are without school facilities and are looking for places to go to school. It does not seem fair when there are 26,000 Indian children roaming the country looking for schools.

I hope the Members of the House will support this amendment and pass it so we can reopen these schools, which are needed, instead of letting the money invested in these wonderful buildings be wasted. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the statement has been made repeatedly this afternoon to the effect that there are 26,000 Indian children in the United States without school facilities. That statement is contrary to a statement made recently by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs before the committee. I read the following from page 894 of the hearings:

Mr. NICHOLS of Oklahoma. Mr. Commissioner, you said that there are 17,000 out of the schools. I would like to ask you if it is not a fact that approximately the whole of that number have close to them public schools which they could attend.

Mr. COLLIER. No; they do not mostly have any public schools that they could attend.

The 17,000 is the figure I gave for a year and a half ago. That has been cut to 14,000 now, and most of them are not accessible to any school. They are in the remote areas.

So there will be no misunderstanding about it, the record shows that 14,000, not 26,000, Indian children are out of school. I assume, of course, that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs knows what he is talking about. For my part I should like to see none of these children out of school.

This committee gave the Indian Office every cent it requested for educational purposes. If more is needed, I am sure Congress will be glad to give it.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield with pleasure to my colleague from Oklahoma, the distinguished Chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Is it not a fact, if the gentleman is not too modest to admit it, that the gentleman from Oklahoma himself played a great part in keeping these boarding schools in the bill this year?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will just say this—

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will not say "yes" to that, I will; that is the fact.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for that statement. It is true that I have not always agreed with the Indian Office with reference to its educational policy, as well as other policies. I did insist, as a member of the committee, that Indian boarding schools be kept open. To close them would work a hardship not only on the Indians but also on our public schools of our respective States.

I am very sympathetic with the gentleman from Nebraska in the closing of his schools. When I first came to Congress, an Indian Agency school was closed in my own district. It almost broke my heart. I speak of the Cantonment Agency near Canton in Blaine County, Okla. Since then I have insisted that the Indian Office do something with the buildings. So, as I said, I can sympathize with the gentleman. But, as the chairman stated, the gentleman had the opportunity of coming before the committee and presenting facts and figures. The gentleman did not do so, at least to discuss the closing of his school.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I was never invited to come before the gentleman's committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Then evidently I have been misinformed. It was my understanding that Chairman TAYLOR had invited the gentleman to appear.

Mr. STEFAN. This is my first term in Congress; things are just nicely getting under way. I was never invited to come before this subcommittee.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I would remind the gentleman that he had a letter from me inviting him to appear before the committee, as did every Member from Nebraska and all of the Western States.

Mr. STEFAN. When was that?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. That was about a month ago. I invited the Members to come before my committee, advising them that I was going to open hearings, and I wanted to know if there was anything under the sun in the entire Interior Department in which they were interested, that if they were, to come before my committee and present the matter. I sent a copy of that letter to the gentleman from Nebraska, and he will probably find it in his files now.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the fact of the matter is that the gentleman from Nebraska did appear before the subcommittee on another matter.

Mr. STEFAN. I appeared on another subject for the Governor of Nebraska.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. And we gave the gentleman a hearing, did we not?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; and I appreciate that very much.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The item was not carried in the bill last year, so naturally we did not carry it in the bill this year.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. So far as the gentleman from Nebraska is concerned, he could not have appeared before the committee when this school was eliminated because he was not then a Member of Congress. I think the RECORD ought to show that he could not have appeared before the committee when the item was stricken out.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to restore an Indian school that was closed more than a year ago. The amount proposed would probably be entirely inadequate to rehabilitate the institution.

It was represented that 26,000 Indian children did not have schools in which they could be educated. I have here a memorandum from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs under date of February 28, 1935, in which the following is stated:

The committee has done everything in its power to amply take care of the education of Indian children. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. WERNER] appeared before the committee and presented a plea for the restoration of the school at Rapid City. The committee took the position that it was almost like unscrambling eggs to reopen these schools after they had been closed for a year or more. It would involve not only the matter of running expenses but also the restoration of the buildings to a condition where they may be used, the repurchase of equipment, and so forth, which would materially increase the expenditures over the amount proposed in the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Committee not to pass the amendment. Your committee has given great attention in detail to the proposed appropriations, and they find no reason whatever at this time for restoring this particular school to the active list.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Is it not true it would cost as much as the original investment in many instances to rehabilitate these schools so that they would be in position to take on boarding students?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. That is the information we have. The schools which were closed were generally those in the worst condition and in the worst state of repair.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks just made on the floor, and to include a statement which I have just received from the Indian Office.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for above-named nonreservation boarding schools, not to exceed \$2,618,575: *Provided*, That 10 percent of the foregoing amounts shall be available interchangeably for expenditures for similar purposes in the various boarding schools named, but not more than 10 percent shall be added to the amount appropriated for any one of said boarding schools or for any particular item within any boarding school. Any such interchanges shall be reported to Congress in the annual Budget.

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AYERS: Page 39, line 6, after the word "budget", insert a paragraph, as follows:

"For aid to the district schools of the counties in the various States, where Indian children of parents residing on nontaxable Indian land are attending such district schools, the sum of \$1,000,000, said aid to be confined entirely to the building of additional buildings and to the building of additions to present buildings, and to be expended in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior and under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him."

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Chairman, in support of this amendment, which I referred to in my argument awhile ago, I shall state that this amendment is undoubtedly in accord with the present policy of the Indian Bureau. I shall prove this statement by statements of Dr. Ryan, of the Educational Division of the Indian Bureau, and by Commissioner Collier, of the Indian Bureau, made by them before the Appropriations Subcommittee on February 12 of this year. I quote from transcript of proceedings before that subcommittee.

This starts with a part of my statement before that subcommittee.

Mr. AYERS. We have either got to go back to the boarding-school system or the Indian day-school system, or find money to build

additions to these public schools. Just one of the two things will have to be done. We have to do something, or otherwise the people who pay the taxes, through the school trustees of the districts, who are members of the taxpaying population of these communities, will make rules excluding the Indian children. That is something that is serious and worthy of a lot of thought. This condition must be corrected if the Indian children are to continue the privilege and benefit of these State schools.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is your reaction to that, Doctor? (Addressing Dr. Ryan of the Indian Bureau.)

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICHOLS. I want to ask the gentleman a question about Indian children who attend day schools. May I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that in every instance of an Indian boy or girl attending public school there is not a per capita payment made to that school district of 40 cents a day on the average to take care of the Indian child?

Mr. AYERS. That is correct, and that includes a noon meal and bus transportation, if you please.

Mr. NICHOLS. Oh, no; not in every instance. May I ask the last gentleman if that does not amount to more at the end of the year than the per capita payment made to the district in the form of taxes for the attendance of white children?

Mr. AYERS. It does not.

Mr. Chairman, continuing my quotations, I read as follows:

Dr. RYAN (answering Mr. Taylor's question). I think that is completely correct. We must assist these communities in the direction of school buildings.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are you figuring in this on meeting that situation? Mr. COLLIER. Not in this Budget. There are two ways to meet it. One is through the authorizing acts which passed the Senate last year, which got out of the committee all right in the House, but were blocked on the floor on the Consent Calendar. There will be a renewed effort to pass them this year, probably through grouping them into one bill, making it important enough, perhaps, to get a rule, and then it would pass.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what my amendment reaches. It is grouping all these cases into one bill, so to speak, and asking an appropriation of \$1,000,000 to take care of all of them, which is in accord with the policy of the Indian Bureau as expressed by Commissioner Collier and the necessity of which was admitted by Dr. Ryan of the educational section of the Indian Bureau.

Mr. Chairman, I insist on this amendment because it is right and just and because the Indian Bureau is for it, as I have shown you by the statements of Dr. Ryan and Commissioner Collier, notwithstanding the fact that the Commissioner refuses to ask the Budget for it. Here is a chance to take the Commissioner at his own word and not irritate the Bureau of the Budget nor change the footings of this appropriating bill a single penny and at the same time write the most humane paragraph of this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman has made a very interesting speech, but I want to remind the members of the Committee there is not one dime in this bill for construction. Money for construction is being given by the Public Works in every instance. Should this Committee embark now on a construction program, we would run into millions of dollars and find ourselves duplicating or conflicting with the public-works program.

I also want to remind the Committee more than a dozen individual bills have been introduced to authorize appropriations for the very purpose the gentleman has in mind. Each one of these bills ought to be considered on its own merits. Certainly we are not going blindly to appropriate \$1,000,000 without knowing what it is for. The gentleman could have suggested two millions, five millions, or \$10,000,000 as easily as \$1,000,000. We are not appropriating money here for construction. This is not a construction measure. Personally, I am very sympathetic with any reasonable effort to assist the gentleman. But he must go to the Public Works Administration and get his money for construction.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Is it not true that Commissioner Collier made the statement to the gentleman himself in the committee that if they obtained any funds from the Public Works Administration for construction purposes it would be allotted to their schools, and all the Indian schools are on the same basis he refers to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is true.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. If the gentleman will permit, let me make this suggestion. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has already received from Public Works \$3,613,000 for school construction and they are going to apply for lots more. This is where the funds will come from, and it is not necessary to provide them in this bill; in fact, we have no construction whatever in this bill for anything, and we ought not to open it up now for something that is going to be taken care of by Public Works.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is the point I have been trying to make. In my opinion \$1,000,000 would not begin to take care of the situation some of our friends have in mind.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman is a member of the committee, and I would like to address a question to him. I notice appropriations are being made for Indians in all parts of the country, but I also notice that no appropriation is being made for a very famous and historic tribe of Indians. I am referring to the Tammany Indians on Manhattan Island. Will the gentleman please explain the omission? [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am not as familiar with those Indians as the gentleman appears to be.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I am afraid it would take many billions to take care of those Indians.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman means under the \$4,000,000,000 relief bill?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. It would take several billion dollars. [Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For aid to the common schools in the Cherokee, Creek, Choctaw, Chickasaw, and Seminole Nations and the Quapaw Agency in Oklahoma, \$398,000, to be expended in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior and under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be subject to the limitation in section 1 of the act of May 25, 1918 (U. S. C., title 25, sec. 297), limiting the expenditure of money to educate children of less than one-fourth Indian blood: *Provided further*, That of this appropriation not to exceed \$2,500 may be expended in the printing and issuance of a paper devoted to Indian education, which paper shall be printed at an Indian school; not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended under rules and regulations of the Secretary of the Interior, in part payment of truancy officers in any county or two or more contiguous counties where there are 500 or more Indian children eligible to attend school, and not the exceed \$10,000 may be expended in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior for the payment of salaries of public-school teachers, employed by the State or county, in special Indian day schools in full-blood Indian communities where there are not adequate white day schools available for their attendance.

Mrs. GREENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Maybe the members of the Committee will be glad to hear I am not offering an amendment, but I am anxious to present the figures that I have been given from different departments as authentic, and I believe they will be of peculiar interest to everybody here. I must say that women are accused of inaccuracies in statistics, but I think it is very much less remarkable than the ability men have to juggle them. [Laughter.]

Some of my best friends have got up here today and said that the department gave them certain figures. They have very little relation to exactly the same figures the same

department gave me on the same subject. So they will interest you. I am going to give you a few figures, and they are usually rather dry, but these will not be dry and they will be very short.

For one winter I served as a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs. We spent ninety-and-odd hours on a bill called the Wheeler-Howard bill. The attitude of the Committee on the Wheeler-Howard bill and its final passage in a very modified form at the eleventh hour is, I think, somewhat responsible for the embarrassment of the Appropriations Committee today, in that they themselves, I think, have been sufficiently confused by all of us. I, for one, did not appear, because I do not feel that the Wheeler-Howard bill is yet an established bill, and for these reasons:

In the year 1850 we had the largest number of recorded Indians in the United States than in any other year—exactly, according to the United States census, 400,764. We were spending at that time in the Indian Bureau to care for 400,764 Indians—our maximum of recorded Indians—\$1,665,832. I have no doubt we did not care for them properly.

The next figure of interest is that in 1900, the Bureau of Census shows our lowest number of Indians, 237,196. At that time we spent \$10,175,107 to care for them.

Now, here is the interesting part of this picture: Today our Indians, as recorded by the Bureau of Census, have increased since 1900 by approximately 90,000, and today we have 327,958, and we spent on them last year \$31,169,296.

We spent \$1,665,802 when we had 400,000 Indians, and today we have 327,958, and we are spending \$31,169,296.

I really dislike very much taking exception to anybody's figures. I do not. I just present this as given me from the Bureau. I shall not bore you with the complete details. Here are the Indian school children in every State in the Union, broken down as of June 30, 1934, into these headings:

The total number of school children between the ages of 6 and 18, 102,440.

In school, 76,264.

This is very interesting. Of the 76,264 in schools, there are 45,678 in local public schools and the rest are divided between the reservation, day; the reservation, boarding; off the reservation, boarding; the mission, private and State, day; and the mission, private and State, boarding; and sanatoriums.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Arizona may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREENWAY. I welcome 5 more minutes, because I think the whole of this Congress is faced with one of the most interesting problems, and I hope that this Committee will encourage the initiative of the Committee on Indian Affairs.

I hope that this Congress will ask of them a detailed report of what is really happening to the Indian. I think that all of us feel that we owe the Indian something more than we owe ourselves, because of injustice done them.

When you think that our Indians are increasing at the rate of 90,000 in the last 34 years, and hope that they will increase at a greater rate, and when we are launching with misgivings on the program called the "Wheeler-Howard bill", isolating the Indians, putting them back on a land program, and spending today \$31,000,000, and still have, according to the records, over one-quarter of the children not receiving the education due them in the United States, it certainly is a grave problem and a challenge to every Member of Congress.

Mr. CULKIN. Can the gentlelady tell me what portion of the 327,000 Indians in the year 1935 are of full blood?

Mrs. GREENWAY. I cannot.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Practically 150,000.

Mr. CULKIN. And the remainder are treated under the governmental policy as Indians?

Mrs. GREENWAY. I am not able to answer accurately.

Mr. AYERS. Will the lady yield?

Mrs. GREENWAY. I yield.

Mr. AYERS. Can the lady tell us what percentage of the Indian population is self-sustaining?

Mrs. GREENWAY. I understand that almost half of them, and that is very encouraging. I will conclude by saying that as a member of the Indian Committee we are up against a grave situation, and we want to do the best we can.

Mr. AYERS. Can the lady from Arizona tell us, in percentage, the Indian Bureau man power engaged in administration of Indian affairs, as compared with the number of Indians in America?

Mrs. GREENWAY. According to the record given me by the Bureau—I have not checked it back—there are over 7,650 members of the administration—43 Indians to every one of the personnel in the administration.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Can the lady tell us how many of those are Indians themselves?

Mrs. GREENWAY. Of the 7,650 personnel, 2,100 are Indians and 5,550 whites. There is one employee to every 43 Indians. I am not sure whether that includes those Indians.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREENWAY. Yes.

Mr. PIERCE. What is the real object of the Wheeler-Howard bill? The tribes in my district have rejected it. I want to know what they are trying to get at.

Mrs. GREENWAY. A wiser person than I am told the gentleman it was too big a subject to answer.

Mr. PIERCE. Why in the world did the gentlewoman recommend it? I voted against it.

Mrs. GREENWAY. I think it would be very illuminating and interesting if the Congress could know the reasons why many Members, in good faith, voted for it and now wonder if they were fair to the Indians in so doing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. MILLARD. Does the gentlewoman from Arizona desire more time?

Mrs. GREENWAY. I thank the gentleman; but I think I have probably said too much already. [Laughter and applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Natives in Alaska: To enable the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion and under his direction, to provide for support and education of the Eskimos, Aleuts, Indians, and other natives of Alaska; including necessary traveling expenses of pupils to and from industrial boarding schools in Alaska; purchase, repair, and rental of school buildings, including purchase of necessary lands; textbooks and industrial apparatus; pay and necessary traveling expenses of superintendents, teachers, physicians, and other employees; repair, equipment, maintenance, and operation of vessels; and all other necessary miscellaneous expenses which are not included under the above special heads, including \$327,380 for salaries, \$17,500 for traveling expenses, \$190,120 for equipment, supplies, fuel, and light, \$25,000 for repairs of buildings, \$63,000 for freight and operation and repair of vessels, \$1,000 for rentals, and \$2,000 for telephone and telegraph; in all, \$626,000, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That not to exceed 10 percent of the amounts appropriated for the various items in this paragraph shall be available interchangeably for expenditures on the objects included in this paragraph, but not more than 10 percent shall be added to any one item of appropriation except in cases of extraordinary emergency and then only upon the written order of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, at this point I ask unanimous consent to make some remarks concerning the Indians of Alaska.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration carries a number of items making appropriations for the operation of the Federal Government in Alaska. One term in Congress as Delegate from Alaska has convinced me that it is, humanly speaking, beyond my power to persuade either a committee or the House itself to enlarge appropriation items above the sums recommended by the Budget. Nevertheless, it is my duty to call the attention of the House to several items in the present bill which I think should be

materially enlarged. These are the items making appropriations for the education and for the medical relief of the Indians of Alaska. In this connection, by the word "Indian" I refer to the native races of Alaska, including the Eskimos.

The amounts carried by this bill for the purposes mentioned—namely, \$626,000 for educational work for the Indians of Alaska and \$295,000 for medical relief—are entirely insufficient to take care of the service that ought to be performed by the United States Government for the natives of the Territory which I represent in Congress.

After all, the Indians and the Eskimos had the whole country to themselves, and under their laws and customs they owned it in their understanding of that term; they owned it, I venture to say, within the real meaning of the word, before the advent of the white man. The Russians largely disregarded all of the claims of the Indians to property rights in what is now the Territory of Alaska, and with the transfer of the Territory to the United States under the treaty of March 30, 1867, there was no change in this respect. The white people who went to Alaska after it became a part of the United States showed equal disregard for the claims of the Indians; and so, whereas in the ancient times we know that the Indian population of Alaska probably exceeded in number 150,000 people, and those people enjoyed, apart from tribal wars and other disturbances, a comparatively secure economic existence, the white men crowded the Indians, as one may say, out of the picture and absorbed to a greater and greater extent the natural resources of the country, so that the Indians were in many cases, in fact in most cases, reduced to a state of poverty. Considering this condition in connection with the history and tradition of the native races, their lack of making provision for the future, the fact that they are particularly susceptible to the diseases brought in by the white man, such as tuberculosis, measles, and other afflictions not known to them before, it is quite understandable that they have been decimated and demoralized, and this demoralization has been greatly aggravated by the introduction of alcoholic liquors among them.

This is no new and no strange tale. The thing that has happened in Alaska to the Indians has happened all over the United States, so that at the present time I cannot recall a single instance where the Indians, in one form or another, in one fashion or another, have not been deprived of their substantial rights.

We cannot go back now and do absolute justice to them. The world has moved on. It is impossible to restore to them everything to which they are reasonably entitled. This impossibility is a physical one. But we can make amends for some of the injustices that have been done to them. We can teach them the arts and sciences of civilization; we can afford them the facilities for a reasonable and profitable education; and we can furnish them with medical relief.

The appropriations carried in the current bill for education and medical relief in Alaska are entirely insufficient. If the amounts were doubled there would be none too much. Eventually I hope the Congress will be of a temper to render a greater degree of justice to our native peoples.

Many of the Indian communities of Alaska are entirely without educational facilities. While the Office of Indian Affairs is rendering a very commendable service with the funds at hand, those funds are entirely inadequate to do what ought to be done. The educational facilities should be greatly enlarged not only to include therein the rest of the natives of Alaska but also to furnish a better education, a more complete education, for the natives in the schools which have been established. By reason of the financial limitations the educational facilities now furnished may be called totally insufficient, although the teachers are generally well trained and devoted to their duties.

On the health side, the picture is even a darker one. Tuberculosis is wide-spread among the natives. A few years ago, when I was a member of the Alaska Territorial Legislature, in investigating this matter we were told that the percentage of tuberculosis among the native races was 16 times as great as among the white people of Alaska. Hundreds, if not thousands, of native children could be saved

from an early death by tuberculosis if they were given the proper care and attention in time. As you all know, after that disease is well fastened on a child, cure is very difficult.

The Office of Indian Affairs has a comprehensive plan for the construction and maintenance of eight hospitals for the natives in the Territory of Alaska, to be in part devoted to the relief of those afflicted with tuberculosis. These hospitals, according to the plan, would be situated in various parts of the Territory so as to afford the best possible service. I am still hopeful that they can be built during the coming year out of public-works funds, even if no other funds are available for such construction.

The Clerk read to line 2 on page 52.

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Chairman, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and place the same in the RECORD, including a statement I made before the Subcommittee on Appropriations with reference to the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the Interior Department appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement made by myself before the Appropriations Committee on February 12, 1935, with reference to the urgent need of Federal aid for the education of Indian children attending State schools. It is as follows:

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Chairman, the building of additions to State schools by the Government is what I have in mind—additions to district schools, public schools, sufficient to take care of Indian children attending such schools. For my State (Montana) alone we had some 9 bills at the last session of Congress, and some 9 or 10 from other States. In each instance the Indians predominate in these public schools. In each district the land is mostly owned by Indians and not assessable, and in all instances the Government has not contributed anything—not a single penny to the buildings. The Indian Department simply pays a small tuition, which to some degree takes care of the overhead expense, but which in no way goes to the construction of additional buildings made absolutely necessary by the increased attendance occasioned by the attendance of the Indian children.

We have either got to go back to the boarding-school system or the Indian day-school system, or find money to build additions to these public schools. Just one of the two things will have to be done. We have to do something, or otherwise the people who pay the taxes, through the school trustees of these districts who are members of the taxpaying population of these communities, will make rules excluding the Indian children. That is something that is serious and worthy of a lot of thought. This condition must be corrected if the Indian children are to continue the privilege and benefit of these State schools.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is your reaction to that, Doctor? (Addressing Dr. Ryan, of the Indian Bureau.)

Dr. RYAN. I think that is completely correct. We must assist these communities in the direction of school buildings.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are you figuring in this on meeting that situation?

Mr. COLLIER. Not in this Budget. There are two ways to meet it. One is through the authorizing acts which passed the Senate last year, which got out of the committee all right in the House but were blocked on the floor on the Consent Calendar. There will be a renewed effort to pass them this year, probably through grouping them into one bill, making it important enough, perhaps, to get a rule, and then it would pass.

Mr. AYERS. I had charge of that proposed legislation. I was chairman of the subcommittee of the Indian Affairs Committee that had charge of these some 18 or 20 bills last session and am familiar with the ax these bills had at that session.

Mr. COLLIER. The other way would be under this new relief grant, if the terms are broad enough, to simply get the money out of that, and go ahead and do it, and that is, I imagine, the place the money will come from.

Mr. TAYLOR. In other words, get it out of this \$4,000,000,000 pot.

Mr. AYERS. That is problematical. That was suggested last year. We made applications for it and were turned down. We got the ax at both ends—in the House and before Public Works.

Mr. COLLIER. They were turned down on the ground that this was private land. Under the new act, its terms may prove to be far more flexible and broad.

Mr. AYERS. The public-works program, Mr. Commissioner, that was talked about, was a loan and a grant on the 70-30 basis, that does not—it cannot—help us. Every one of these districts is now bonded up to the State constitutional limit.

Dr. RYAN. We have been securing funds for schools that are public schools that have not been on the 70-30 basis, wherever there was Indian-owned land.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are you making any attempt toward meeting that situation in Montana?

Dr. RYAN. We have done it in all the cases we could. We have included these public-school situations in every instance where the investigation showed that a large number of Indians were involved and a large amount of untaxed Indian land.

Mr. TAYLOR. Do these become observable in your neck of the woods?

Mr. AYERS. Not at all. We have not been able to get results, and in every instance in Montana Indian land is included in the district—it is mostly Indian land in many instances. In the instances of this condition in other States—North Dakota, South Dakota, Washington, and all other States in this condition—the districts include Indian land, and none of them have gotten any building relief; yet the Indian children increase more rapidly than the white children. The Indians are "Bull Moosers"; they just keep multiplying and the children increase, but the building situation remains the same; no help in that respect from the Department.

Mr. COLLIER. The Budget last year would not agree with us. The Department endorsed the bills and asked the support of the Budget, and the Budget withheld its endorsement, and that was responsible for the withholding of unanimous consent by one of the objectors over on the House floor. I do not know whether we can change the Budget on that or not. I am inclined to look to the relief bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. Have you any suggestions, Mr. Ayers?

Mr. AYERS. I do not have much hope from that source. This public works will be administered by someone to be appointed by the President under the new bill. We will have to educate him to this need, and by that time another year goes by. If there were direct appropriations provided in this appropriation bill, the matter would be settled. It is certainly legitimate Indian expenditure and ought to be in the Indian Affairs budget and in this bill. My idea is to go at it direct and in the way it ought to be done. It has become a matter of "buck passing" with us Members from the States that have these schools. That is what our constituents think, and justifiably so—that is what I think.

Mr. TAYLOR. Can you not get a supplemental estimate sent up here to us?

Mr. AYERS. I think the Bureau could do that; yes.

Mr. COLLIER. We cannot. We know that. The Budget would not approve it, anyhow. That was the trouble last year.

Mr. AYERS. Well, if we cannot get an estimate from the Bureau of Indian Affairs, then I know we are victims of "buck passing."

Mr. COLLIER (interposing). The estimate means they have agreed to it, and they would not agree to the authorizing act and would maintain it as new legislation. This would be the use of Federal money to build public-school buildings on land that the Federal Government does not own, and I am not aware that we have any authority for it in existing law.

Mr. AYERS. Then, we are not going to get the use of public-works funds for this same excuse. If it is just a matter of "buck passing" on this, let this committee make an appropriation or go back to the Indian day schools and Indian boarding schools. We have to have relief and the Indian children must be educated, that is all there is about it; hence it is necessary to make the appropriation or go back to the old plan.

Mr. TAYLOR. Have you got it in the Indian boarding schools now?

Mr. AYERS. In Montana, we have one or two small ones; they are just reservation small boarding schools.

Mr. COLLIER. Montana is practically 100 percent on a day-school basis now, and has been for a number of years.

Mr. AYERS. Yes; the Indians are practically 100 percent in State schools. The local taxpayers are supporting all these without a penny for maintenance of buildings, just a little tuition money. Surely we are not supposed to go on under these conditions.

Mr. TAYLOR. They say these buildings are all on private lands. Mr. AYERS. On school-district lands. It is private so far as the Government is concerned, because it is owned by each school district, but the major portion of the lands in the district is non-assessable Indian land.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The maintenance is the big thing.

Dr. RYAN. The tuition runs about 40 cents a day.

Mr. COLLIER. Where possible we pay the full maintenance cost.

Mr. AYERS. There is one reservation where half the land belongs to whites and half to Indians. The Indian land is not assessable. Four affected school districts are on this reservation, and three of them have high schools which are open to the Indian children. They are teaching in basements and renovated coal sheds and places of that kind, because of being overcrowded by Indian children.

Dr. RYAN. Their treatment of the Indians is A1.

Mr. TAYLOR. There ought to be some means of remedying that.

Mr. COLLIER. We have done what we have never been allowed to do before. We went to bat on this last year. We openly split with the Budget. We are willing now that these several bills be put together into one bill, and then it will be a big enough bill to make it possible to get a rule, and, in that event, the consent obstacle is removed.

Mr. TAYLOR. How much is involved there?

Mr. AYERS. Well, I do not recall. I have a brief on it which I used in arguing the bill on the floor last session. There were then 9 or 10 such schools in Montana—it has increased now by two or three more.

Dr. RYAN. There is a whole series.

Mr. COLLIER. If Congress would pass this relief bill in anything like the present form, the technical objections would be wiped out and the schools could be built out of the new relief money.

Mr. TAYLOR. What do you mean in anything like its present form?

Mr. COLLIER. The bill as now drawn gives the President a discretion so wide he could undoubtedly allot money.

Mr. TAYLOR. You mean this \$4,000,000,000?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes. It is far broader than the original bill, the original public-works bill. If it is kept in this form, the money can probably be had out of that, and I think it will not be difficult to get. The buildings could be started promptly and there will be plenty of local influence.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should think the two Senators and the Representatives could get it out of that \$4,000,000,000.

Mr. COLLIER. There were factors in the act which the appropriating power could not override.

Mr. TAYLOR. Have we still got those technical features?

Mr. COLLIER. Not in the relief bill as pending now. Of course, we do not know what they will do to it in the Senate.

Dr. RYAN. We have had relief for situations like this except that the land happened to be actually Indian or Government-owned land. It is a public-school situation and we are for it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will you just advise me when that bill comes back from the Senate whether or not there is anything we can do to it to fix it up.

Mr. AYERS. I appreciate the assistance that men like yourself have given, men who understood the situation.

Mr. TAYLOR. That bill will come back to conference and the deficiency subcommittee will have charge of it.

Mr. COLLIER. In the State of Montana the public-school method is universal and satisfactory, except for the matter of congestion in buildings to the whites and to the Indians.

Mr. AYERS. There is no race trouble at all. The Indian children are welcome, but the Government must help on the building situation. We cannot go further.

Mr. COLLIER. Far from being an untried policy, as Mrs. GREENWAY says, it is a thing that goes back many years and has been perfectly tried and satisfactory, and the same can be said of Arizona.

Mr. AYERS. It has been the policy since the act of 1932 to do away with the boarding schools and eliminate them and send the Indian children to the district schools of the State, which, as I said before, is not supported at all by the Indian patrons.

I just wanted to get this situation before you gentlemen and to impress upon you the seriousness of it. If something is not done, it will put Indian children out of school next year. We just cannot handle it under present conditions.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. The 40 cents a day; that is merely maintenance alone, is it not?

Mr. AYERS. That simply goes for the additional teachers made necessary by the Indian attendance.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. That is the overhead in operation, but it does not take in anything by way of construction costs or depreciation?

Mr. COLLIER. It is plant investment; yes.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. But not the original investment?

Mr. COLLIER. It does not take in the capital investment.

Dr. RYAN. The Senate Indian Committee made a special study and recommended we pay up as far as we could to the actual running costs, and that is what we try to do.

Mr. COLLIER. Of course, if we had a firm congressional policy, there would be nothing to prevent us paying in tuition an additional sum large enough to carry a share of the bonded indebtedness. The difficulty there is you are going on year after year with expenses, and the bonded indebtedness has to be predicated on the ability to pay across a term of years. It ought to be met by the frank method of a Federal grant.

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank you and your committee for this opportunity to appear before you.

Mr. TAYLOR. We are very glad to have had you come in.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MEAD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6223) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3464. An act to amend certain sections of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901, as amended, relating to descent and distribution.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BULOW and Mr. WHITE members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments", for the disposition of useless papers in the Civil Service department.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the reading of the Journal and the conclusion of business on the Speaker's table I may be permitted to address the House tomorrow morning for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN]?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Reserving the right to object, it might be interesting to know upon what subject.

Mr. HARLAN. On the same subject upon which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] addressed the House this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

YOUNG PEOPLE IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech made by the Postmaster General to the Young Democrats at Tampa on a visit to my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am submitting herewith the following address made by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman Democratic National Committee, before the convention of Young Democratic Clubs of Florida, at Tampa, Fla., on Friday, February 15, 1935:

I know it is customary on such occasions as this to tell the young men and women that the Nation is their inheritance and that it will devolve on them, before the passage of many years, to run this Government of ours and to charge themselves with the destiny of the country.

I would like to amend this rather trite declaration. It seems to me that now, and not merely the future, represents the opportunity of youth. It is a time of change—not a change in our system of government or a change in our Constitution—but a departure from old processes, a recasting of method consequent to new situations and new problems.

There is, of course, a tradition—or perhaps a better term would be a superstition—that gray beards and wrinkles are requirements for positions of dignity and power.

Experience is, of course, a vast asset. But the only way to acquire experience at any game or any business is by getting into it. The idea that rashness is a necessary attribute of anybody less than 60 years old is a proven fallacy.

The great parts in not only the national but the international drama have not infrequently been taken by young men. This is shown by our own history. The names of those to whom we refer as the founding fathers of our Government suggest to us the figures of historical old paintings. We get the idea that all of them were stern-faced old gentlemen, who wore stocks instead of collars, bell-crowned hats, and ruffled shirts.

The reason for this is that these pictures were made after the subjects had performed their great accomplishments, whereas the fact is that in the formative period of our country these men were in the full flush and fire of early adult years.

Even the immortal Washington was in his early forties when it fell to him to command the military forces of the Nation being born.

You may be sure that he was not intrusted with this mighty responsibility without a scanning of his previous accomplishments. He was a major and adjutant general of a military district of Virginia when he was 19. He was only 21 when he was sent by his State to visit the French Army in the Ohio Valley, presumably to see if the war clouds then gathering could not be dissipated. Instead these clouds resulted in the storm of battle, and we find him a lieutenant colonel when he was 22, and an aide to the British general in command when he was 23, and 2 years later he was selected as commander in chief of the colonial forces in the pre-revolutionary struggles between France and Great Britain. He was only 26 when he became a member of the Colonial House of Burgesses.

Take John Adams, who followed Washington into the Presidency. He was 3 years younger than Washington. And we find him a member of the General Court of Massachusetts when he was 33, and 6 years later he was in the Continental Congress, signed the Declaration of Independence, and nominated Washington for the generalship of the American Army.

Go on to the third President of the United States—Thomas Jefferson. He was 26 when they put him in the Colonial House of Burgesses. He was 33 when he drafted the Declaration of Independence, and at 36 he was the Governor of Virginia.

John Quincy Adams, who followed Jefferson in the Presidency, was in politics almost from the time he came of age and a member of the United States Senate about as early as the Constitution permitted. And his successor, James Monroe, entered the Revolutionary Army when he was 18, was a lieutenant colonel when

he was 22, and a member of the Continental Congress when he was 24.

It is not my purpose to recite to you the roster of our Presidents and what they did as young men, but merely to point out that the first five of our Chief Executives entered public service in what would be popularly called their "immature years", and made such reputations for themselves that the country turned to them, one after another, to sit in the position of highest authority in the young Nation.

Not being a historian, I will not attempt to recite to you the criticisms which were heaped on these appointments and elections because of the youth of Washington, Adams, Jefferson, the younger Adams, and James Monroe. But I am willing to wager that there were plenty.

I have no doubt that the ancients of that day stroked their quivering chins and raised their aged eyes to heaven as they contemplated the policy of intrusting mere boys with grave responsibilities.

Perhaps there were older men with more experience available, but the time called for virility, promptness of decision, and the courage of youth. So they did their parts, and the verdict of their contemporaries was justified and endorsed by the history of succeeding decades.

Incidentally, it was not only the young men of that period who did big things. It was before the days, of course, when alert young women sat at their employers' elbows with a flying pencil and an almost equally rapid typewriter, but the wives and daughters of a great number of the Members of the Continental Congress performed the clerical work, intensely important and intensely secret, of their husbands and fathers. And I have a sneaking suspicion that much of the clarity of expression and literary quality of some of the speeches was contributed by these unsung heroines of the most important legislative session ever held.

Then, of course, we had Betsy Ross, of debutante age, who made the first American flag almost before there was an Army to fly that flag.

And that young New Englander, Molly Pitcher, who showed General Israel Putnam's hastily enrolled farmers how to serve the guns at the Battle of Monmouth.

And a little later on came Dolly Madison, who, when her husband was President, saved the precious records of the White House as the British were advancing on it and carried them to security with her.

Add to this list the thousands of girls who patched the uniforms of the Continentals and mitigated the winter suffering of the troops with their contributions of knitted socks, mittens, and comforters.

You may notice, if you read the outcries of our Republican opponents, that no inconsiderable part of their criticism is directed toward the presence in the Government of men and women comparatively young. And, perhaps, you young Democrats may note the parallel of these times with the strenuous period at the birth of the Republic. One would think, if he listened to Republican statesmen, old in years and ancient in ideas, that our great President had gone into the highways and byways to dig out mere infants to aid him and advise him in the conduct of the Government through a period of great stress.

Fortunately, most of these contemporary figures, who are as out of date in their governmental theories as those represented in the oil paintings with their old-fashioned clothes and periwigs, have been retired by the people. Fess, of Ohio; Smoot, of Utah; Watson, of Indiana; Arthur Robinson, of the same State; Moses, of New Hampshire; and many others have been replaced by able, energetic Democrats who are in step with the spirit of the time.

Your organization, and hundreds of thousands of other young men and women not yet affiliated with it, though they are close kin to you in sentiment, played a great part in the retirement of these reactionaries who remained on the political stage so long beyond the period when their usefulness had ceased.

It was the youth of the country, with fresh ideas, with impatience at the old, helpless, drifting order that had dominated this country for a dozen years, who had the courage to face the economic wreck into which the country had been permitted to sag, and who made possible the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and last November gave his administration the most complete endorsement ever received by a President of the United States since the days of those great statesmen whom I cited to you as examples of the success of young men in our history.

Incidentally, your President is himself an example of the opportunity for young men in public service. He was elected to the New York State Senate when he was 27, was Assistant Secretary of the Navy when he was 31 (his service embracing the period of the World War) and he was Democratic candidate for Vice President when he was 38. Two terms as Governor of New York constituted his preparatory school from which he stepped into the Presidency.

That young legislator and a colleague were named on a committee to take up the subject of social legislation, in which they were both ardently interested. These two enlisted as an aid a young woman who had already made considerable reputation along these lines. Three people gained their first distinction in these sessions, a quarter of a century ago, and, you may say, they are still conferring along the same lines, for one is President, the other is Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, and the third is Secretary of Labor PERKINS, the first woman ever to sit in a President's Cabinet.

Of course, I cannot promise all of you that you will be Presidents of the United States or even that you will parallel the

career of Henry Clay, who achieved fame in his early twenties and who was elected to the United States Senate when he was 29.

But I do mean to say that the path blazed by these great men is open to any of you who has the ability, integrity, and industry to strive for responsibilities and to prove equal to them as they are attained.

It was not by ambition alone that the towering figures in Democratic politics reached their high goals. More important was the zeal to be of service to their country. Men do not gain the higher ranks of our Government simply because of the desire for power or a place in history.

Occasionally, of course, somebody gets there by accident, but in ninety-nine cases in a hundred they achieve these high places because what they have shown in capacity and in public interest has been so impressive that the people have been willing to accept what the record shows as a title to promotion.

Party politics of the most practical kind is a necessity in a nation committed to the two-party system. Organization is the keystone to party success. But all the tricks of the politician, all the expedients of election strategy amount to little unless the candidate for whom they are performed is worthy of the job in which the party strives to place him.

Even party success does not add much to the historical total of accomplishment unless success in election is followed by success in administration. That success can only be achieved by real devotion to the public welfare. The people are as quick to punish as to reward when it comes to public office.

Unsuccessful politicians like to dwell on what they call the fickleness of the voters. It is not the people who are fickle. They put men in office to do the work of government—to do what is best for the country and most in accord with the national desire.

True, we have now and always have had vociferous minorities who have clamored for this or that radical measure. These have been very noisy at times, and the loudness of their clamor has given a false impression as to their number. But beneath the smoke raised by the advocates of economic and political nostrums, advertised to cure our troubles overnight, there is a great and controlling body of citizens whose votes take care of the Nation's destiny. It is a curious thing that while no business man would care to be told how to run his business by one without experience in such a business, in the case of the Government—the biggest business of all and concerning everybody—many a man with a loud voice and a theory feels he is more competent to administer the Nation's affairs than one whose life has been spent in the public service.

Organized minorities have not infrequently created a lot of commotion. When they have formed a solid bloc they have been able, by throwing their strength to whichever party was willing to accept their ideas, to control specific areas.

They have unfortunately managed in this way to get a representation in Congress far in excess of their numerical deserts. In the conspicuous instance of prohibition they even achieved a national success, temporary because the fallacy of their experiment brought the country to its senses. But while the eighteenth amendment was in effect it cost the country a lot, not only in revenue but in morale. Perhaps the most unfortunate consequence of their ill-starred victory was the example they set. Ever since the prohibitionists showed what could be done by a solid minority in the direction of political terrorism, many other groups have sought to impose their particular theories by the same method.

I confess I have a good deal of sympathy for Congressmen and congressional candidates whose districts are plagued by the presence of such groups and who feel that their election involves support of a cause for which they have no sympathy. But there is only one honest course open to men so placed. They may survive for one term or so as candidates of a faction whose ideas of what constitutes public welfare are at variance with their own, but inevitably they are going to bear the brand forever. When the people are suffering under enactments in which such an officeholder joins, he is going to be one of the first victims of popular wrath and resentment. It all comes down to the principle I have already enunciated, that permanent success in public office can only come with adherence to a man's own devotion to public welfare.

I think you will agree with me that our Republic is passing through a period of as great stress as it has ever experienced since the days when the young men stood to their guns barefooted, ragged, and hungry with Washington, making the struggle for our national independence. You may be sure that in that time there were not lacking voices of advisers who counseled them to admit failure and go back to foreign allegiance, pointing out that independence was an idealistic dream of immature minds engaged in a reckless experiment.

The mental processes of Tories do not vary. They abhor any kind of change and never cease to cite each difficulty of an attempt to make things better as an evidence of the break-down of whatever is being undertaken. The Tories of the days of Valley Forge talked and thought along the same lines as the Tories of 1933.

Their doleful prophecies of disaster failed then, as they are failing now. But let us not forget that the Revolutionary War lasted much longer because of the shooting from the rear and the encouragement of the enemy by those who would not realize that destiny may be delayed but cannot be averted by such guerrilla tactics.

The favorite target of those who today would like to see the administration of President Roosevelt other than a success is the

size of the fund required to combat unemployment and to keep people alive—people whose destitution comes through no fault of their own but by reason of a great economic disaster in which the whole world shares, and from which, incidentally, the United States of America is emerging more definitely than any other great nation.

These critics of the administration shudder at the thought of increased taxes in the future. I wonder how they would feel if, instead of a problematical prospect, they were paying today and had been paying for years such tax rates as Great Britain, for example, has had to impose upon the subjects of King George? Whatever the price of saving our millions of unemployed and their families from famine and cold, that price must be paid. Some military authority estimated in 1919 that another year of war would have brought our national debt to \$50,000,000,000. Does anybody suppose that our Nation would have faltered at that staggering debt if the alternative had been the loss of the war and the appalling consequences of a peace imposed on us? In comparison with such amounts, our contemplated expenditures for saving lives, instead of for killing people, seem anything but extravagant. Nor is the problem of reducing the resulting national debt going to be a task beyond the capacity of the Nation to perform.

You will recall that during the days of our prosperity the national debt was steadily diminished and that taxes by which this was accomplished were by no means unendurable. We are a bigger, richer country than we were then.

The credit of the United States is at a high point here and abroad. Our dollar is the strongest of world currencies, as evidenced by the inflow of gold to this country. The billions spent in relief do not have to be paid in a day or a year. And so, when our period of stress is over, you will find the national debt being paid gradually, almost painlessly; and by the time you young Democrats are running the businesses of this country the fears of today will seem in retrospect no more substantial than those that existed a dozen times during the life of our Nation. Those fears now live only in the pages of the history books and other volumes that are consulted by the schoolmen who are concerned with the age-long story of finance.

In any event we have got to go through with what we are doing. Nobody as yet has offered a serious alternative to President Roosevelt's recovery program. There is a lot of grumbling, naturally; some of it by those who can see no virtue in anything a Democratic administration does, some of it by those impatient ones who think that miracles are possible by which a disturbed world can be set aright overnight.

They have no intelligent substitute to offer for the course being followed by the President. But they have a delightful time construing every ripple on the sea of politics, every disagreement between a couple of minor Government officials, every error in the recovery processes to which attention is called when that error is corrected, as evidences of the failure of the program. That's all right, too.

I suppose that such things are unavoidable in a politically minded country, particularly as there are no real issues on which the administration can be challenged. The verdict of last November's election shows how little impression this sort of thing has on the public mind.

This is about as good a time as any to tell you that what has happened and is happening is no surprise, either to the President or the rest of the administration you put in power 2 years ago. Franklin D. Roosevelt had no delusions as to the magnitude of the task that confronted him when he came to the White House. He knew then and has never lost sight of the difficulties that lay ahead of him. Fortunately, he is a man of infinite patience as well as capacity, courage, and industry. He has met each situation as it arose without panic, without discouragement, and without the slightest lessening of his faith in the ultimate outcome. Under such a leader the war against adversity is bound to result in victory. You placed him where he is. You put the burden of recovery upon his shoulders. And as a closing word I summon you now to give him the same loyalty, the same confidence that you exhibited in 1932 and in 1934, and I know that the call will be heeded by you and that you will celebrate with him a final victory more important to our beloved country than any victory we have won.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BINDERUP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk I be allowed to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include a radio speech by Frank Belgrano, national commander of the American Legion, made last night.

Mr. KVALE. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. KVALE. I understand the request is to be coupled with a request by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] to include the two addresses together.

Mr. FISH. I have no objection to that. If the gentleman wants to put in the address he made I have no objection whatever.

Mr. KVALE. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is on his feet. I suggest that the two gentlemen collaborate.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I have no objection to the gentleman putting in his own remarks, but I do object to the remarks of any commander of any legion or any other organization.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the request as it is now made.

PAYMENT OF THE ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a speech made by Hon. WILLIAM CONNERY and Hon. James E. Van Zandt, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, made at the "Hello America" program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, why did the gentleman not include that with the other two and have the whole program consistent?

Mr. McFARLANE. It is a part of the same program.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I reserve the right to object. Inasmuch as the question of the veterans' adjusted compensation has come up and one speech has gone in, I am not going to object to the speech of Mr. Van Zandt, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following addresses delivered by Hon. William P. Connery, Jr., of Massachusetts, and James E. Van Zandt, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, at the Hello America program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars February 14.

REMARKS OF HON. WILLIAM CONNERY, CHAIRMAN OF THE LABOR COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Comrade Commander in Chief, Madame President, my comrades of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, it is a pleasure for me to join this Nation-wide gathering of overseas veterans to do honor to our commander in chief, Jimmy Van Zandt. He merits our esteem and affection. His driving dynamic work will live long in the hearts of America's service men.

The veterans of the World War are much concerned, and quite properly so, with the legislation now pending before the Congress, which has for its purpose the immediate cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates. Many do not realize that the service men who offered their lives on foreign soil to protect their country are the only ones who have not been paid. The bonus claimed by the munition, the shipping, and other profiteering groups amounting to thousands of millions of dollars have all been paid. It is sufficient for me to mention merely that after all the war contractors, the railroads, and other groups having claims on the Government following the war had been paid in cash, then the Congress decided to pay the veterans, who really won the war, a dollar a day for service in this country and a dollar and a quarter a day for the time spent overseas. This compensation to be paid in addition to the pitiful amount given them while they were serving under the colors, but 20 years after the law was passed.

Ever since the enactment of that law, which gave these certificates to the men who served their country during the World War, the Veterans of Foreign Wars have consistently fought to have this debt immediately paid instead of waiting until 1945 as the certificates provide shall be done. At the present time H. R. 1, the Patman bill, for the immediate payment of these certificates, is before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. The Veterans of Foreign Wars are supporting this bill, and I believe you should all realize the deep necessity for the immediate passage of H. R. 1. If this bill is enacted into law, we will be able to pay the debt now due the World War veterans without the issuance of any tax-exempt bonds and without increasing the national debt.

The Patman bill provides that the Treasury of the United States shall issue money for the payment of these certificates. When I make this statement I immediately expect to hear the cry "unbridled inflation." It will absolutely and positively cause no such condition, because this United States money will be exactly the same kind of money which the Federal Reserve banks in this

country are privileged to issue. However, there will be one feature about it which will be quite different than the Federal Reserve money. As you know, the Federal Reserve banks place United States Government bonds with the Treasury and the Treasury in turn prints money for issuance by the Federal Reserve banks. While the Federal Reserve banks have the use of this money printed by the United States Government, they also get their regular annual interest on their bonds. Your national banks are in the same position. The national bank in your community sends to Washington a million dollars worth of bonds and the Government sends that bank \$950,000 worth of United States money, printed in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and the national bank has the use of that money to loan to its customers at 6- or 7-percent interest and at the same time the bank receives interest on the bonds deposited in Washington. Now, my comrades and friends, you can see why the great bankers of this country throw up their hands in horror when they realize that \$2,000,000,000 might be paid the veterans of the United States without allowing them, the bankers, to cut in on the payment in any way.

With no bonds upon which they can obtain interest, they are greatly worried for fear the money racket they now enjoy may be injured.

Last year the bankers claimed that the payment of the bonus, calling for the issuance of \$2,000,000,000 in currency, would mean inflation. Last year the Government had a debt of twenty-five billion. This year, while we now owe thirty-five billion, we are not charged with having gone to inflation, although we owe ten additional billion of the two billion called for in the Patman bill. Apparently we do not go into inflation until we pass the bonus bill.

In supporting the Patman bill, I believe the Veterans of Foreign Wars are doing a patriotic duty. They are asking for the payment of a long overdue debt which will reach into every nook and corner of the United States. It will bring happiness to homes that are now dark with despair. It will give a renewed courage to those comrades of yours and mine who have been victims of the greatest economic depression the Nation has ever known. It will kindle again the comradeship we found in the shell holes and trenches of France, and will offer at least a sense of temporary economic security to more than 3,000,000 of the boys who willingly served their Nation in 1917 and 1918.

My comrades of the World War, while we realize the payment of the adjusted-service certificates is a great and major problem now confronting the Congress, we must never forget the obligation we have for the few remaining veterans of the war which preserved the Union in 1861 to 1865. The care and love of a great nation must be given in full measure to these men and their dependents as long as a single one of them may remain with us.

We must also remember the swamps and jungles with their malaria and fever, where American boys fought to preserve the Nation's honor in 1898 during the War with Spain. This, the greatest volunteer Army ever raised in the United States must likewise have our deep consideration. I sincerely trust that we will never again witness a group of fine patriotic service men such as the Spanish War veterans having to suffer as they were forced to suffer after the passage of the economy law in 1933.

When we discuss the problems of the service men of the United States we must at the same time consider the problem of their dependents, and we should set up in this land a definite program for the care of dependents of all veterans so that they may never find their way to the "almshouses" anywhere in the country. The progress of our Nation is founded upon the loyalty of its citizens. In time of national emergency, the citizens must be imbued with a sense of their national obligations to the extent that they are willing to serve in the armed forces to protect the honor of our country. If we are to maintain this feeling in the United States it is going to be necessary to make sure before another war may come that the gouging of the war profiteers will not be permitted. We must enact legislation which will remove the profit element from war. Let us see our captains of industry and the heads of our great financial systems suffer at least the economic hazard of war the same as a soldier. If it is permissible to send human beings into the bloody theater of conflict it certainly should be equally as desirable to force those who pile up gigantic fortunes, because of the soldier's bravery, to endure and make some sacrifice during war time. I believe that we should draft capital and industry as well as man power in the event of a crisis which would call out our armed forces. It has been said that this will require a constitutional amendment. If that is necessary it should be done. Let us place at least as high a valuation on human rights in time of war as we do upon profiteers' rights and if we do I am confident much of the war talk all over the world will cease and international difficulties will be settled by arbitration and this as well as other nations will enjoy a lasting peace.

Congress reacts to the wishes of the American people. The bankers and others who are opposed to the passage of the Patman bill, with millions to spend, flood Congress with all sorts of counterfeit arguments against the Patman bill. I ask those of you who favor the passage of the Patman bill to write your Senators and Congressmen asking their support of H. R. 1, the Patman bill.

In closing, I want you to know that the history of this Nation clearly shows that it has been our national policy, as set forth by the immortal Lincoln in his second inaugural address, to care properly and adequately for those who served their country in

time of national emergency. As long as I live I will feel it my duty, and it will be a pleasure indeed to join with the Veterans of Foreign Wars and other patriotic organizations to perpetuate that sacred principle.

ADDRESS OF COMMANDER IN CHIEF JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

Hello America! Greetings and felicitations! On behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, we hope that you are enjoying this unique radio hour as a source of entertainment, information, and inspiration. We are more than happy to have you participate with us in this Nation-wide meeting, this radio reunion of America's A. E. F.

There are two points I wish to cover before we take up the obligation ceremony that will tonight make overseas veterans full-fledged members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. First, on behalf of our organization in every section of the country, I want to thank most sincerely the National Broadcasting Co. for the generous use of its facilities in the presentation of this program. We also appreciate the cooperation we are enjoying on this occasion from nearly 60 individual stations affiliated with the National Broadcasting Co.

For the information of those radio listeners who may not be familiar with the aims and purposes of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, I want to tell you something about the nature of our organization and its objectives.

Our organization has a background of age and experience. We were founded in 1899, by a small group of veterans who had just come home from the Philippines in the War with Spain. These men conceived the idea of forming a veteran fraternity—one that would live for generations to come—an organization in which the overseas veterans of America's wars and campaigns would always find sanctuary. The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is a distinctive veteran organization because it is made up exclusively of overseas veterans. This is one veteran organization that can never be used as a springboard to political fame or public prominence by the veteran who spent 30 days or less in an Army camp near his home or cruising the waters of Lake Michigan. Our members are not confined to the veterans of any one particular conflict. They represent service in practically every corner of the globe, from Santa Domingo to Siberia, from France to the Philippines, from China to Chateau Thierry, from Nicaragua to the North Seas, and from Mindinao to the Marne. Our ranks will continue to be open to those who may be called upon to serve under the Stars and Stripes on foreign soil, or in dangerous waters, in the future.

Since 1899 the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has devoted its efforts to three main objectives—the welfare of our disabled comrades, proper care and consideration for the widows and orphans of those veterans who are deceased, and the preservation of those institutions and principles which guarantee the safety and security of America as a world power.

To date, as an organization, we have been instrumental in the enactment of legislative measures that have definitely contributed to the attainment of these three objectives. In pointing to the legislative benefits that have been created for the disabled veteran, and for the widows and orphans, we seek neither glory nor credit. We point to these achievements merely to demonstrate our usefulness as a veteran fraternity. As veterans, it is only natural that we should understand the problems of the veteran, and do everything that we can to assist him and his dependents. It would be unfair to both the veteran and the American people if those of us veterans who are able-bodied saw fit to leave this problem of veteran welfare in the hands of those who are nonveterans and incapable of giving this responsibility their sympathetic understanding.

In looking to the future, a greater membership has made it possible for us to increase our objectives. Today we are concentrating on a seven-point program. Quite logically, and as always, our first objective is the welfare of our disabled comrades. In our study of conditions among those who are suffering from physical handicaps, we have discovered that the truly deserving veteran—the overseas veteran—has been made the unfortunate victim of piecemeal legislation. In trying to keep down expenditures, with hard and fast rules demanding proof and evidence that is no longer available, Congress has overlooked the underlying principle of all veteran welfare legislation. That principle is based on the desire of the American people that adequate care and compensation be provided for the men who saw actual service.

To correct this situation, we are demanding the adoption of a uniform pension, or compensation, principle that will consider the merits of each claim in accordance with the length and type of service rendered by the veteran seeking compensation. There are thousands of disabled veterans in this country today who receive no help from the Federal Government, simply because legal proof of the source of their disabilities is lacking. These men were young and healthy when they went overseas. But they were not the same strong, vigorous men when they returned home. Even though they still had their arms and their legs, they were far from physically sound. Anxious to be home again, thousands of these veterans deliberately ignored or misrepresented their physical condition. They felt confident that the normal routine of civilian life would soon restore their health and vigor.

For the first few years many of these men have been able to carry on. Then suddenly, without warning, time begins to take its toll of battered nervous systems and weakened bodies. Today our World War comrades are dying at an alarming rate. More

than 3 veterans are dying each hour out of every 24—a daily average of 80. By a year from tonight more than 30,000 World War veterans will have joined their comrades in the great beyond. These are Government statistics. They can neither be ignored nor denied. They stand as stark evidence that this country is guilty of rude neglect and base ingratitude if we fail to give the disabled veteran the sympathetic consideration he truly deserves.

The second point in our program demands an adequate pension for World War widows and orphans and for the dependent mothers of the deceased veteran who served his country with honor. These women and children are the innocent victims of the ruthless machine of war. They are in no way responsible for their unfortunate circumstances. When we force them to accept public charity we are insulting the memory of the Unknown Soldier. We are forgetting the solemn promises we made as a Nation to those who volunteered their lives on the altar of patriotism.

Our third objective happens to be particularly prominent in the news of today. Among veteran fraternities the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has been the militant pioneer in the demand for immediate cash payment of adjusted-service certificates. We feel that this demand is more than ever justified today because of existing economic conditions and the situation that confronts more than three and one-half million World War veterans. We know that unless these men receive the balance that is due them on these certificates they will be the victims of gross injustice. At least 85 percent of those veterans who hold these certificates have been forced to borrow 50 percent of the face value. For these loans the Government is charging compound interest. This interest is consuming the balance that is due. Instead of receiving \$500 in 1945 when these certificates are supposed to mature, the average veteran will receive approximately \$68. Even this paltry sum will be denied to more than 300,000 veterans who are destined to die within the next 10 years.

Let us go back to 1917 and 1918. We had two classes of patriotic citizens—those who marched away in uniforms and those who marched to the banks and bought bonds. Uncle Sam sold a total of \$22,000,000,000 worth of Liberty bonds. These bonds have been drawing interest annually. In other words, the patriot who would not serve but was willing to lend his money, has been receiving a cash bonus each year for the use of that money. But the man who offered his life, if necessary, has been told he must ask for nothing. These very people who bought Liberty bonds and are getting a cash bonus each year in the form of interest in exchange for their patriotism are today branding the veteran as a "Treasury raider." But we hear no voice in protest against the cash bonus that is being paid by Uncle Sam each year to the holders of Liberty bonds. If economic conditions make it necessary to postpone payment, or repudiate our debt to the veteran, then we can also repudiate our debt to those who bought Liberty bonds. But let it be understood that we abhor and stand opposed to the repudiation of any debt that is made in good faith between Uncle Sam and his citizens. This country promised every man who entered the service a decent opportunity to rehabilitate himself upon his return. He was told he could give up his job and his career. We assured him of a hearty welcome and a generous helping hand upon his return.

I have discussed briefly the first three points of the seven-point program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. I call your attention to the fact that the next four points deal exclusively and unselfishly with the welfare of the Nation as a whole. We favor prosecution and the deportation of Communists and other individuals who advocate the overthrow of our Government by force and violence. As veterans, each of us has made a personal sacrifice toward the preservation of our form of government. We intend to see that those sacrifices were not made in vain. We cling to the conviction that there are no substitutes for the spirit of Americanism and the Constitution of the United States. We demand legislation that will rid this country of those aliens and agitators who merely come to our shores to provoke armed upheaval and the overthrow of the Republic.

If this country must participate in another war, point no. 5 of our program demands the conscription of capital and industry, without profit, upon the same basis as our armed forces. We rightfully believe that in time of war, every citizen—rich or poor—has an equal obligation to his country. If we can call upon the young men of America to sacrifice their lives, and their health, in defense of the United States against its enemies, we certainly have an equal right to call upon wealth and industry to fulfill that same obligation of loyalty.

In previous wars we have always called upon the veteran to bring these wars to a close. Today the veteran is taking it upon himself to see that these wars never start. In other words, the overseas veterans of this country are sick and tired of bleeding and dying and suffering in wars that are promoted and instigated primarily for personal profit by individuals in high places, both here and abroad. We regard the present international traffic in arms as one of the main causes of war. We demand that the United States lead the way toward future world peace by immediately assuming full and complete control of the manufacture of arms and munitions within the boundaries of this country. When other nations are forced, by their own people, to adopt similar tactics, we sincerely believe that the threat of war on a huge scale will never again constitute a serious menace to civilization.

The actual experience of facing death in front of a machine gun, or on the high seas, will transform an idealist into a very practical person. Ideals are of little help when a torpedo hits your ship in mid-ocean, or a sniper aims for a bullseye as you bury your face in the mud. That is why the overseas veteran is able to regard

this question of world peace from a practical point of view. He has come to the conclusion that the practical people in the past have been promoting wars for a profit and using the idealists to fill up the trenches. Through the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the overseas veterans of this country call upon the Federal Government to eliminate the danger of future wars by eliminating the would-be profiteers.

In our seventh and final point we are still being practical when we demand an adequate national defense with an Army, Navy, and Marine Corps in accordance with the recommendations of the War Department. Being practical, we refuse to take world peace for granted. We insist that Uncle Sam must be properly armed in order to enforce his desires for world peace. Besides demanding an adequate national defense, we stand opposed to any foreign entanglements or international treaties that will involve the affairs of this country with the problems of Europe and other continents. We believe, with Thomas Jefferson, in the principle of "peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none."

These seven points summarize the activities and the objectives of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. They cover a multitude of accomplishments to date. I regret that time does not permit me to give you a complete picture of the scope of our labors. In more than 3,000 local communities this organization is laboring for the betterment of the country as a whole. At Eaton Rapids, Mich., through our own efforts, we have a child-welfare project that is second to none, and where we are providing the orphans of our disabled comrades with the opportunity to become honest, patriotic, and loyal citizens of the United States. Throughout the land we are developing a program of junior activities that is designed to bring physical, cultural, and moral benefits to the youth of America. We are spreading the doctrines of Americanism and the principles of good citizenship in a sincere effort to combat the serious spread of crime. Within the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States the oath of allegiance that every overseas veteran assumed upon entering the service, continues to inspire him as a solemn obligation to be carried in his heart forever.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LARRABEE, of Indiana, for 3 days, on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 38. An act for the relief of Winifred Meagher; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 39. An act for the relief of the estate of William Bardel; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 41. An act for the relief of the Germania Catering Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 42. An act for the relief of Emmett C. Noxon; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 84. An act to amend section 61 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, relating to depositories for money of bankrupt estates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 239. An act for the relief of the Barlow-Moore Tobacco Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 246. An act for the relief of Elmer Blair; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 271. An act for the relief of James Foy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 281. An act for the relief of the Fred G. Clark Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 282. An act for the relief of William Kemper; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 314. An act for the relief of Vito Valentino; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 410. An act to provide fees to be charged by the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 416. An act for the relief of Las Vegas Hospital Association, Las Vegas, Nev.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 563. An act for the relief of the Jay Street Terminal, New York; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 581. An act for the relief of Harold E. Seavey; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 674. An act authorizing the President to order Maj. E. P. Duval before a retiring board for a hearing of his case, and upon the findings of such board determine whether or not he be placed on the retired list with the rank and pay

held by him at the time of his resignation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 694. An act for the payment of the claims of the Fidelity Trust Co. of Baltimore, Md., and others; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 742. An act for the relief of Charles A. Lewis; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 760. An act for the relief of Harry P. Hollidge; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 781. An act for the relief of the estate of George B. Spearin, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 876. An act for the relief of Edgar Joseph Casey; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 878. An act for the relief of Ray Funcannon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 879. An act for the relief of Denis Healy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 894. An act for the relief of Robert H. Wilder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 921. An act for the relief of C. J. Mast; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 927. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to give war-time rank to retired officers and former officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and/or Coast Guard of the United States", approved June 21, 1930, so as to give class B officers of the Army benefits of such act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 929. An act for the relief of the Southern Products Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 1016. An act to empower the health officer of the District of Columbia to authorize the opening of graves and the disinterment and reinterment of dead bodies in cases where death has been caused by certain contagious diseases; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1027. An act for the relief of Dr. R. N. Harwood; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1036. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of Dr. George W. Ritchey; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1039. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of the West India Oil Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1053. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of the Rio Grande Southern Railroad Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1054. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of White Bros. & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1057. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1059. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of Francis B. Kennedy; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1062. An act for the relief of James R. Young; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1094. An act for the relief of Claude C. Martin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1110. An act for the relief of A. Randolph Holladay; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1121. An act for the relief of Isidor Greenspan; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1298. An act for the relief of John Z. Lowe; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1325. An act for the relief of Dino Carbonell; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1328. An act for the relief of the Snare & Triest Co., now Frederick Snare Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1347. An act for the relief of Robert J. Smith, alias William McClocklin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1363. An act for the relief of John A. Jumer; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 1390. An act for the relief of Harry L. Reaves; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1425. An act to amend section 80 of chapter 9 of an act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1427. An act for the relief of Lyman I. Collins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1487. An act for the relief of Mick C. Cooper; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1585. An act for the relief of Stefano Talanco and Edith Talanco; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1616. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1712. An act to amend section 4878 of the United States Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to burials in national cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1781. An act for the relief of George Voeltz; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1803. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to pay certain expenses incident to the training, attendance, and participation of the equestrian and modern pentathlon teams in the Eleventh Olympic Games; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1846. An act for the relief of the estate of Anton W. Fischer; to the Committee on Claims.

S. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution for the establishment of a commission for the construction of a Washington-Lincoln Memorial Gettysburg Boulevard connecting the present Lincoln Memorial, in the city of Washington, with the Battlefield of Gettysburg, in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Roads.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to provide for the completion of the publication of the writings of George Washington.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 330. An act for the relief of Sophie de Sota;

H. R. 529. An act granting compensation to George S. Conway, Jr.;

H. R. 3373. An act for the relief of Anna S. Carrigan;

H. R. 3982. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between Rockport, Ind., and Owensboro, Ky.;

H. R. 5701. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Indiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Wabash River at or near La Fayette, Ind.;

H. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the California-Pacific International Exposition, to be held at San Diego, Calif., in 1935 and 1936, authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to provide for the completion of the publication of the writings of George Washington.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 1, 1935, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARING

(Friday, Mar. 1)

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

Hearing at room 213, House Office Building, tomorrow, March 1, on bills pertaining to star mail route service.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

238. A letter from the Chief Examiner of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a schedule of papers which are not needed in the transaction of public business and which are of no permanent value or historical interest; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

239. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to authorize the acquisition, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of certain land for the extension and remodeling of the post-office building at Jonesboro, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. DARDEN: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 5576. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 2045. A bill to set aside certain lands for the Leech Lake Band of Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota; without amendment (Rept. No. 262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. House Resolution 117. Resolution to suitably inscribe the bust of former Speaker Joseph G. Cannon; without amendment (Rept. No. 264). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. House Joint Resolution 156. Joint resolution to make available to Congress the services and data of the Interstate Reference Bureau; without amendment (Rept. No. 265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. H. R. 5732. A bill to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for books for the adult blind; with amendment (Rept. No. 266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLER. Committee on the Library. House Joint Resolution 147. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a monument to Grover Cleveland, in Washington, D. C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. H. R. 5263. A bill to purchase and erect in the city of Washington the group of statuary known as the "Indian Buffalo Hunt"; without amendment (Rept. No. 269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MEAD: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. House Report 270. A report on the investigation of the Post Office Department pursuant to House Resolution 226 (72d Cong.), House Resolution 59 (73d Cong.), and House Resolution 33 (74th Cong.). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MEAD: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. House Report 271. A report on the investigation of the Post Office Department pursuant to House Resolution 226 (72d Cong.), House Resolution 59 (73d Cong.), and House Resolution 33 (74th Cong.). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MEAD: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. House Report 272. A supplement report on investigation of Federal building materials, payment of architects, bonds, postal leases, vacant bank buildings, pursuant to House Resolution 226 (72d Cong.), House Resolution 59 (73d Cong.), and House Resolution 33 (74th Cong.). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MEAD: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. House Report 273. A report on the investigation of the Post Office Department, pursuant to House Resolution 226

(72d Cong.), House Resolution 59 (73d Cong.), and House Resolution 33 (74th Cong.). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. HARTER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 594. A bill for the relief of Roy Beck; without amendment (Rept. No. 260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. THOMASON: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3800. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to lend Army and Navy equipment for use at the national jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America; without amendment (Rept. No. 263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. H. R. 5762. A bill authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Medal of Honor to Dr. George E. Holtzapf; without amendment (Rept. No. 267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRUNNER: A bill (H. R. 6278) consolidating the post offices in the County of Queens, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ELLENBOGEN: A bill (H. R. 6279) to amend section 2 of the act approved June 30, 1879, so as to permit women to serve on juries in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 6280) to encourage home ownership, to revive the building trades, and to relieve unemployment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6281) to create the Farm Homes Corporation, to promote more secure occupancy of farms and farm homes, to correct the economic instability resulting from some present forms of farm tenancy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma (by departmental request): A bill (H. R. 6282) to reduce the area of the Fort Peck irrigation project in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 6283) to provide for the measurement of vessels using the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 6284) to amend an act entitled "An act to improve the navigability and to provide for the flood control of the Tennessee River; to provide for reforestation and the proper use of marginal lands in the Tennessee Valley; to provide for the agricultural and industrial development of said valley; to provide for the national defense by the creation of a corporation for the operation of Government properties at and near Muscle Shoals in the State of Alabama, and for other purposes", approved May 18, 1933; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 6285) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Chesapeake Bay between Baltimore and Kent Counties, Md.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 6286) to authorize the conveyance by the United States to the State of Minnesota of certain lands in Morrison County, Minn.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SHORT: A bill (H. R. 6287) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to enroll on the tribal rolls of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations all Choctaw and Chickasaw claimants whose names appear in the citizenship cases hereinafter mentioned and who were duly and legally enrolled by the Federal court, and the heirs now living of all such claimants, born prior to the closing of said

tribal rolls by an act of Congress; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CONNERY: A bill (H. R. 6288) to promote equality of bargaining power between employers and employees, to diminish the causes of labor disputes, to create a National Labor Relations Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 6289) to grant certain public lands to the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DRIVER: A bill (H. R. 6290) to authorize acquisition of land to provide appropriate means of access to the post-office building at Jonesboro, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: A bill (H. R. 6291) to provide for the payment of veterans' adjusted-service certificates in negotiable bonds of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLER: A bill (H. R. 6292) to provide for the reappointment of Frederic A. Delano as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 6293) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws by discouraging, preventing, and punishing the crime of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Resolution (H. Res. 136) for the consideration of H. R. 4016; to the Committee on Rules. Also, resolution (H. Res. 137) for the consideration of H. R. 5576; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 138) for the consideration of H. R. 5577; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 139) for the consideration of H. R. 5599; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANKIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 191) to extend the period of suspension of the limitation governing the filing of suit under section 19, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SNELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) making available appropriations for relief purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 6294) for the relief of Fred Harker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DORSEY: A bill (H. R. 6295) for the relief of Edna Broome; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEHRMANN: A bill (H. R. 6296) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mary Sero Johnson (nee Mary Sero); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN: A bill (H. R. 6297) for the relief of Leon Frederick Ruggles; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6298) granting an increase of pension to Agnes Bentley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McFARLANE: A bill (H. R. 6299) granting an increase of pension to D. H. Waide; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MEEKS: A bill (H. R. 6300) granting a pension to James M. Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 6301) granting a pension to Sadie Saunders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6302) granting a pension to Emma J. Rose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6303) granting an increase of pension to Dora Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6304) granting a pension to Margaret Scofield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6305) granting an increase of pension to Sarah I. Tomlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6306) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Van Treese; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6307) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6308) granting an increase of pension to Martha Ann Parsley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6309) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Hudgens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6310) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Humphreys; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6311) granting an increase of pension to Anna Laird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6312) granting an increase of pension to Analiza Robb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 6313) granting a pension to James A. Holley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ZIONCHECK: A bill (H. R. 6314) for the relief of Ludwig Rose; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2187. By Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring adoption by the Senate of the United States of a resolution now pending before it relating to religious persecution in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2188. By Mr. BOYLAN: Letter from the LaManna, Azema & Farnam Co., Inc., New York City, protesting against the passage of the Bland bill (H. R. 70); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2189. Also, petition signed by W. L. Husband and other residents of New York City, opposing the passage of the Wheeler-Rayburn public-utility bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2190. By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota: Petition of W. W. Adams, secretary, and O. A. Mittelstadt and other members of the resolution committee of the Fergus Falls (Minn.) Townsend Plan Club, praying for immediate consideration and passage into law of the Townsend old-age-pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2191. Also, petition of R. H. McFarlin, adjutant, and members of the Nels T. Wold Post, No. 20, of the American Legion, Department of Minnesota, of Crookston and vicinity in Minnesota, favoring the Vinson bill (H. R. 3896) to make the immediate cash payment of the soldiers' adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2192. By Mr. CITRON: Petition of the Common Council of the City of New Britain, Conn., approving a General Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2193. By Mr. DELANEY: Petition of Gen. John R. Brooke Camp, No. 28, National Indian War Veterans, United States Army, of New York, urging the passage of House bill 2857; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2194. By Mr. DIETRICH: Petition of Group No. 1372 of the Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, Forest City, Pa., urging favorable action by Congress on House Joint Resolution 81 and Senate Joint Resolution 11, directing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2195. Also, 25 petitions signed by many residents of the Fifteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, urging the defeat of Senate bill 1725 and House bill 5423, known as the "Public Utility Act of 1935"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2196. By Mr. FORD of California: Resolution of the City Council of Los Angeles, expressing approval of the President's plan of relief by the construction of worth-while projects in order to provide employment to those needing it, and urging the Representatives from the city of Los Angeles and the California Senators to support the President's plan of relief to the fullest of their ability; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2197. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of Walter Barber and other citizens of Monticello, Sullivan County, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of the public-utility bills (S. 1725 and H. R. 5423); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2198. Also, petition of citizens of Maplecreek, Hensonville, Ashland, and Windham, Greene County, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of the public-utility bills (S. 1725 and H. R. 5423); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2199. Also, petition of 136 residents of the town of Liberty, Sullivan County, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of the public-utility bills (S. 1725 and H. R. 5423); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2200. Also, petition of 176 residents of Sullivan County, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of the public-utility bills (S. 1725 and H. R. 5423); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2201. By Mr. HAINES: Petitions signed by approximately 924 residents of the Twenty-second Congressional District of Pennsylvania, protesting against the enactment the public-utility bill (H. R. 5423); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2202. By Mr. HART: Memorial of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2203. By Mr. HULL: Petition of Dr. F. K. Laramy, of Chippewa Falls, Wis., and 216 others, memorializing Congress to enact into law the Townsend revolving old-age pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2204. Also, resolution of the Wisconsin State Legislature, memorializing Congress to pass uniform laws regulating motor vehicles in interstate service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2205. Also, resolution of Group No. 646 of the Polish National Alliance of the United States of America, Thorp, Wis., memorializing Congress to enact House Joint Resolution 81 and Senate Joint Resolution 11, directing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2206. Also, petition of William R. Hudson and 32 others, of Unity, Wis., regarding the immediate payment of the soldiers' bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2207. Also, memorial of the Wisconsin State Legislature, memorializing Congress to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide for a referendum of the people before war can be declared; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2208. Also, joint resolution of the Wisconsin State Legislature, memorializing Congress to make the manufacture and sale of munitions of war a monopoly of the Federal Government to take the profit out of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2209. Also, joint resolution of the Wisconsin State Legislature, memorializing the Congress to provide for public-power development and especially rural electrification in the upper Mississippi Valley as proposed in pending bills in Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2210. By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio: Petition signed by 21 furloughed railroad men, asking for legislation to regulate mileage basis of 26 days a month instead of 38 days as is now in force; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2211. By Mr. KENNEY: Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2212. Also, joint resolution adopted by the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt measures directed against mob violence and lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2213. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of Metal Polishers Union, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the Connery 30-hour-week bill; to the Committee on Labor.

2214. By Mr. MERRITT of New York: Petition of Matthew J. Fischer and other citizens of Brewster, N. Y., urging Congress to defeat the public-utility bills (S. 1725 and H. R. 5423); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2215. By Mr. MERRITT of Connecticut: Petition of employees of the Bullard Co., Bridgeport, Conn., protesting against the passage of the Black-Connery 30-hour-week bill; to the Committee on Labor.

2216. By Mr. MILLARD: Petition signed by residents in Westchester County, N. Y., opposing enactment of the holding-company bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2217. Also, petition signed by residents of Rockland County, N. Y., opposing enactment of the holding-company bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2218. By Mr. NELSON: Petition of citizens of Eldon, Mo., asking for changes in law relating to star routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2219. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2220. By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia: Petition of the City Council of the City of Savannah, requesting Congress to approve the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2221. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Permatex Co., Inc., Sheepshead Bay, N. Y., concerning the 30-hour-week bill; to the Committee on Labor.

2222. Also, petition of the Falcon Packing Co., Inc., New York City, favoring reenactment of 4-cent excise tax on copper imports in the new revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2223. Also, petition of the National Gauge Corporation, Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing the Connery bill (H. R. 2746); to the Committee on Labor.

2224. Also, resolution of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, New York City, protesting against the \$1,000,000,000 defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2225. By Mr. PITTINGER: Petitions from Harry Wing, H. G. Seaman, Joseph Schley, Irene Johnson, and others, relating to old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2226. By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Petitions of citizens of the State of New Mexico, residents of the county of San Miguel, numerous signed, urging the passage of House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, the Pope plan for direct Nation-wide impartial system of small, reasonable pensions to persons over 55, free of State participation or State interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2227. Also, petitions of citizens of the State of Kentucky, residents of Jefferson, Marshall, and Monroe Counties, all numerous signed, urging the passage of House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, the Pope plan for direct, Nation-wide impartial system of small, reasonable pensions to persons over 55, free of State participation or State interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2228. Also, petitions of citizens of the State of Illinois, residents of the county of Cook, numerous signed, urging the passage of House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, the Pope plan for direct Nation-wide impartial system of small, reasonable pensions to persons over 55, free of State participation or State interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2229. Also, petitions of citizens of the State of North Carolina, residents of Mecklenburg, Spray, and Wilson Counties, numerous signed, urging the passage of House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, the Pope plan for direct Nation-wide impartial system of small, reasonable

pensions to persons over 55, free of State participation or State interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2230. Also, petitions of citizens of the State of Missouri, in the county of Howell, numerous signed, urging the passage of House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, the Pope plan for direct Nation-wide impartial system of small, reasonable pensions to persons over 55, free of State participation or State interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2231. Also, petitions of citizens of the State of Oklahoma, residents of Camanche, Dewey, Le Flore, and Love Counties, numerous signed, urging the passage of House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, the Pope plan for direct Nation-wide impartial system of small, reasonable pensions to persons over 55, free of State participation or State interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2232. Also, petitions of citizens of the State of Ohio, residents of the county of Stark, numerous signed, urging the passage of House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, the Pope plan for direct Nation-wide impartial system of small, reasonable pensions to persons over 55, free of State participation or State interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2233. Also, petitions of citizens of the State of Louisiana, residents of Evangeline, Morehouse, and Vernon Parishes, numerous signed, urging the passage of House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, the Pope plan for direct Nation-wide impartial system of small, reasonable pensions to persons over 55, free of State participation or State interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2234. Also, petition of citizens of the State of Alabama, residents of the county of Greene, numerous signed, urging the passage of House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, the Pope plan for direct Nation-wide impartial system of small, reasonable pensions to persons over 55, free of State participation or State interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2235. Also, petition of citizens of the State of Arkansas, residents of Bradley, Cross, Jefferson, and Sevier Counties, numerous signed, urging the passage of House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, the Pope plan for direct Nation-wide impartial system of small, reasonable pensions to persons over 55, free of State participation, or State interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2236. Also, petitions of citizens of the State of Georgia, residents of Habersham and Richmond Counties, numerous signed, urging the passage of House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, the Pope plan for direct Nation-wide impartial system of small, reasonable pensions to persons over 55, free of State participation, or State interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2237. Also, petitions of citizens of the State of Mississippi, residents of Holmes, Leake, Leflore, Sunflower, and Webster Counties, numerous signed, urging the passage of House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, the Pope plan for direct Nation-wide impartial system of small, reasonable pensions to persons over 55, free of State participation, or State interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2238. Also, petitions of citizens of the State of Tennessee, residents of Dyer, Madison, McMinn, and Shelby Counties, numerous signed, urging the passage of House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, the Pope plan for direct Nation-wide impartial system of small, reasonable pensions to persons over 55, free of State participation, or State interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2239. Also, petitions of citizens of the State of Texas, residents of Falls, Houston, Hamilton, Montague, McCulloch, Madison, Navarro, San Saba, Victoria, Waller, Wharton, and Williamson Counties, numerous signed, urging the passage of House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, the Pope plan for direct Nation-wide impartial system of small reasonable pensions to persons over 55, free of State participation or State interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2240. Also, petitions of citizens of the State of Virginia, residents of Grayson, Tazewell, Washington, Wythe, and Wise Counties, numerous signed, urging the passage of House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, the Pope plan for direct Nation-wide impartial system of small, reasonable pensions to persons over 55, free of State participation or State interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2241. Also, petition of citizens of the State of South Carolina, residents of the county of Pickens, numerous signed, urging the passage of House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, the Pope plan for direct Nation-wide impartial system of small, reasonable pensions to persons over 55, free of State participation or State interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2242. By Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire: Petition of the Alfred Gooding Guild, of Portsmouth, N. H., by John W. Anderson, president, and Ernestine L. Cleary, secretary, urging the adoption by Congress of antilynching legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2243. Also, petition of the common council of the city of Portsmouth, N. H., by Robert W. Marvin, mayor, and Peter J. Hickey, city clerk, recommending the designation of October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's memorial day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2244. Also, petition of Group No. 2745 of the Polish National Alliance of the United States, Manchester, N. H., recommending the designation of October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's memorial day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2245. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the Massachusetts Senate and House of Representatives, favoring the adoption by the Senate of the United States of a resolution relative to religious persecution in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2246. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of Evelyn Copeland, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the public-utility bill (H. R. 5423); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2247. Also, memorial of the assembly, legislature of the State of New York, favoring the Rudd bill (H. R. 6) authorizing the Postmaster General to construct underground pneumatic tubes for the transmission of mail between the general post office in Brooklyn and the Floyd Bennett Field, Barron Island, Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Post Offices and Post Roads.

2248. By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of Jessie Caviness and 103 other citizens of Montezuma and San Juan Counties, Colo., urging passage of House bill 2856, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2249. By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Petition of certain citizens resident of Canton, county of Van Zandt, State of Texas, numerous signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2250. Also, petition of citizens of Smith County, Tex., urging passage of an old-age pension bill as sponsored by Hon. WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2251. Also, petition of citizens of Mineola, in the State of Texas, numerous signed, urging the passage of House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, for direct Nation-wide impartial system of small, reasonable pensions to persons over 55, free of State participation or State interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2252. Also, petition of citizens of Longview, in the State of Texas, numerous signed, urging the passage of House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, for direct Nation-wide impartial system of small, reasonable pensions to persons over 55, free of State participation or State interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2253. Also, petition of citizens of Tyler, in the State of Texas, numerous signed, urging the passage of House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, for direct Nation-wide impartial system of small, reasonable pensions to persons over 55, free of State participation or State interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2254. Also, petition of citizens of Bullard, Smith County, Tex., urging passage of old-age pension legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2255. By Mr. SMITH of Connecticut: Petition of the Connecticut Farmers Cooperative Auction Association, signed by Philip J. Wadhams, auction master, favoring passage of House bill 5802; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2256. By Mr. TARVER: Petition of Rev. N. R. Hogan and 46 other citizens of Murray County, Ga., favoring old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2257. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of Stenographers, Typists, Bookkeepers, and Assistants Federal Labor Union, Toledo, Ohio, by their recording secretary, Elizabeth Connors, favoring Senate Resolution No. 69, introduced in the Senate by Senator LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH, of the State of Washington, thinking that a thorough congressional investigation of the entire automobile industry will convey to Congress and to the public generally of the intolerable conditions existing in the automobile industry; to the Committee on Labor.

2258. Also, petition of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, Union No. 7, Toledo, Ohio, by their recording secretary, C. E. Thomas, urging support of Senate Resolution 69, introduced by Hon. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH, of Washington; to the Committee on Labor.

2259. Also, petition of Westminster Foundation and Memorial Presbyterian Church, by Eliot Porter, urging church pension amendment to the economic-security bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2260. Also, petition of the Colored Men's Council, Springfield, Ohio, by their secretary, Roy H. Howard, respectfully requesting their Congressmen to support the Wagner-Costigan bill, or any similar act directed against lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2261. Also, petition of Fremont Post, No. 2947, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Fremont, Ohio, by their commander, Carl R. Stine, requesting support of House bill 1, introduced by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, which calls for the immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2262. Also, petition of Stenographers, Typists, Bookkeepers, and Assistants Federal Labor Union, No. 19708, of Toledo, Ohio, by their recording secretary, Elizabeth Connors, favoring the adoption of the McCarran amendment to the Public Works relief measure; to the Committee on Labor.

2263. By Mr. TURNER: Petition of citizens of Iron City and Cypress Inn, in the State of Tennessee, numerous signed, urging the passage of House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, for direct Nation-wide impartial system of small, reasonable pensions to persons over 55, free of State participation or State interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2264. Also, petition of citizens of Hohenwald, in the State of Tennessee, numerous signed, urging the passage of House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, for direct Nation-wide impartial system of small, reasonable pensions to persons over 55, free of State participation or State interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2265. Also, petition of citizens of Prospect, in the State of Tennessee, numerous signed, urging the passage of House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, for direct Nation-wide impartial system of small, reasonable pensions to persons over 55, free of State participation or State interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2266. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Common Council of the City of Portsmouth, N. H.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2267. Also, petition of the Common Council of the City of Stamford, Conn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2268. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of San Diego, Calif.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2269. Also, petition of the Junker-Ball Post, No. 1865, Veterans of Foreign Wars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2270. Also, petition of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, N. J.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2271. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of Worcester, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2272. Also, petition of the Common Council of the City of Quincy, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2273. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Alameda, Calif.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2274. Also, petition from the City of Savannah, Ga.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2275. Also, petition of the Rotary Club, of Greeneville, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

2276. Also, petition of the Common Council of the City of Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2277. Also, petition of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Salt Lake, Utah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2278. Also, petition of the Alfred Gooding Guild, Young People's Religious Union of the South Church; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2279. Also, petition of the Board of Representatives of the City of Tampa, Fla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2280. Also, petition of Group No. 56 of the Polish National Alliance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2281. Also, petition of the Common Council of the City of Springfield, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2282. Also, petition of the Shreveport Chamber of Commerce, Shreveport, La.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 1, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Merciful God, we swing the incense of praise and thanksgiving before the altar of the Lord. Here we would dedicate the things we love and the manifold spiritual gifts of our God; O breathe upon them like the light that falls upon the hills of earth. The injunction of Thy holy Word is with us: "Commit Thy way unto the Lord." Any purpose in any worthy ambition, any way we are called to tread, Heavenly Father, fortify us with Thy unerring guidance. By faith may we take Thy assuring promise about the circuit of our lives, keeping ourselves unchilled by the blasts of sin. Throughout our country, bless all unifying forces which are enriching brotherhood and creating mutual bonds of loving and reverent attachment. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may be privileged to meet this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

BATTLE MONUMENTS

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Military Affairs, I ask unanimous consent that House Joint Resolution 178, directing the American Battle Monuments Commission or its successor to restore the inscriptions obliterated from the Three Hundred and Sixteenth Infantry Memorial erected by a French organization on property of that organization at Sillon-Fontaine (Cote 378), Territoire de Sivry-sur-Meuse, be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, what is the nature of the resolution?

Mr. HILL of Alabama. It is a joint resolution directing the American Battle Monuments Commission to restore certain inscriptions on monuments erected abroad.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Several years ago the Congress authorized at considerable cost that there be prepared an annotation of the act to regulate commerce. That work was performed; six volumes were issued, bound, and every Member of the House received three or four bound sets through the folding room. There has just been issued three additional volumes. No provision has been made for binding. The Members of the House are entitled to one copy from the document room; but, I repeat, no provisions have been made to print and bind additional copies and send them through the folding room so that Members can have a complete set.

I should like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LAMBETH], a member of the Joint Committee on Printing, if he will take this up with the Joint Committee on Printing and see what arrangements can be made for the binding of the three additional volumes and their distribution to the Members through the folding room.

Mr. MICHENER. Are they in the folding room at the present time?

Mr. COCHRAN. No. But they should be printed and bound and sent through the folding room. As I said, there is in the document room a set of the three new volumes for every Member, but they are not bound.

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Speaker, replying to the gentleman from Missouri, the matter the gentleman calls to the attention of the House is entirely new to me. The gentleman might take it up with the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and the special orders for today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] yesterday morning, concerning the Belgian Reciprocity Treaty, was but a repetition of the old argument that has been so often repeated here. "The treaty was produced by star-chamber methods and by this proceeding we had given away the inalienable rights of American farmers and laborers to make their own living by permitting Belgian imports to come into the United States." He was most scrupulous not to include in his remarks any of the concessions that Belgium had made to our exporters.

This has been the constant policy of all speakers arguing against these reciprocity treaties, and it brings to light the real and only issue that there is in the whole question. That is: Shall we continue to conduct our whole national life for the benefit of those manufacturers who produce exclusively for the home market and cut the throat of all producers who gain their livelihood out of manufacturing in the United States and exporting abroad? We may take the records of imports and exports back through the years and we will find that imports of goods plus imports of services, which includes money paid out to foreign investors for interest, carriage charges, and money spent by our tourists abroad, will equal our exports. Prior to the World War, because of extensive tourist travel, large foreign investments in the United States, and the fact that we had little or no merchant marine to